

The Reformed Church Review

Volume 2

JULY, 1923

Number 3

I

THE EINSTEIN THEORY FROM THE STAND- POINT OF PHILOSOPHY¹

RAY H. DOTTERER

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries philosophical thinking was dominated by mathematics. The model science of the period was astronomy; and what is astronomy but mathematics? Accordingly Descartes, Hobbes, Spinoza, all attempted to philosophize *more geometrico*. In the nineteenth century, on the other hand, the place which had been held in the former period by the mathematical sciences was taken by biology. Especially in the latter part of the century the idea of development, of origins, held the field. Now in the third decade of the twentieth century, there is reason to believe that the reign of biology is approaching its end; that the biological sciences will be compelled to share the throne with the ancient, and perhaps the rightful monarch, mathematics. This is apparent in the field of the very small and also in the field of the very large. The physico-chemist is resolving the atom into protons and electrons, and an attempt is being made to construct an astronomy of the intra-atomic events. If chemistry can thus be reduced to mathematics, and if biology can be resolved into chemistry, it is evident that the revenge of mathematics is at hand.

¹ The literature is very extensive. The following references are suggested, and it may be well to read them in the order in which they are given: Slosson, *Easy Lessons in Einstein*; Eddington, *Space, Time, and Gravitation*; Einstein, *Theory of Relativity* (translation by Lawson).

In the field of the very large, Einstein is seeking to transform both physics and astronomy into a species of geometry.

When we consider any hypothesis, we are confronted by three questions: (1) What does the hypothesis mean? (2) Is it true? (3) What follows? If the hypothesis be accepted, how will it modify our view of the world?

In the case of the relativity hypothesis, the answer to the second question—Is it true?—must, I suppose be left to the physicists, the astronomers, and the mathematicians. The discussion which follows will be chiefly concerned with the first question, and with the third.

What, then, is this theory of relativity? In philosophy, relativity is an old story. In logic we learn that certain *terms* are relative. Words like *far* and *near*, *rich* and *poor*, have no meaning unless you specify a standard of comparison. A distance of a mile is far, if you are thinking of walks on the college campus or in a small town, but near, if you are thinking of a railroad journey. A man worth a hundred thousand dollars is poor if you compare him with the Rockefellers, Morgans, or Rothschilds, but rich, indeed, as compared with some of us. It is all a matter of relativity. Again we are familiar with the idea of relativity in the case of *value*. Which is worth more,—a pound of gold, or a pound of bread? The answer obviously depends upon circumstances. Value is relative to the situation.

Long ago, the Sophists taught that "man is the measure of all things." It was a doctrine of relativity. Put your right hand into hot water, and your left into cold water. Keep them immersed for a few minutes, and then plunge both hands into a vessel of luke-warm water. Is the water warm or cold? It will be warm to the one hand, cold to the other. Temperature is relative. The same is true of taste; a substance which ordinarily tastes sweet may be bitter to one who is suffering from a fever. That color, too, is relative, will be a commonplace to anyone who has tried

to match ribbons by artificial light. The fabric changes its color with the change of light.

The recognition of relativity in the case of temperature, color, etc., led to a distinction between those qualities which were called "primary" and those which were called "secondary." The former were supposed to be genuine properties of the object; they were qualities both of the idea and of the thing. The latter, on the other hand, were regarded as properties of the subject; they were qualities of the idea, but not of the thing. Thus size, shape, mass, texture, and motion were said to be objective; while color, sound, odor, taste, and temperature were said to be subjective.

Philosophy, then, is accustomed to the idea of relativity. Some philosophers, indeed, not content with the distinction between primary and secondary qualities, have maintained that *all* qualities are relative to the percipient. The world, they say, is a "function of our sense-organs." All relations, including the cognitive relation, are "internal" or "constitutive." In other words, everything is constituted by the relations in which it stands. Compared with views of this sort, our contemporary "theory of relativity" is a doctrine of moderation. Whether we can agree with it or not, those who have read philosophy can take it calmly. We shall find, indeed, that the theory as developed by Einstein and his disciples contains or presupposes certain *absolutes*. It is not a doctrine of thorough-going relativity such as we find, for example, in a Heracleitus or a Hegel.

Nevertheless the views of Einstein are materially different from those which until quite recently prevailed in physics. The physicist has, as a rule, been pretty well satisfied with the distinction between primary and secondary qualities. Indeed, a large part of his work has been the attempt—attended with a remarkable degree of success—to explain the latter in terms of the former. Thus *qualitative* differences like those in pitch or color, have been reduced to *quantitative* differences, to differences of wave-length in air

or ether. Einstein, however, maintains that not only sound, taste, color, etc., are relative to the observer, but that essentially the same is true of such so-called "primary" qualities as mass, distance, and time. And *mass, distance, and time* are, of course, the fundamental concepts of physics.

Long before Einstein's day, however, philosophers had recognized the relativity of *motion*. Whether we shall say that a given object is at rest or in motion depends entirely upon the point of view. (As we shall see a little later, this applies only to motion of translation, and not to rotation.) If an object is at rest with respect to the earth, it will be in motion with respect to the sun; if it is at rest with respect to the sun, it will be in motion with respect to other heavenly bodies. Indeed, if there were only two bodies in the universe, and the distance between them was changing, it would be idle to inquire which of the two is moving. The question would be without meaning; for motion must be defined with respect to a specified somewhat; and in the case which we have supposed to obtain, one of the two bodies would be in motion with respect to the other, and the other would also be in motion with respect to the one. In technical language, rest and motion are relative to some "frame of reference."

In the same way, says Einstein, mass and distance and time are relative to our frame of reference. In Newton's laws of motion the mass of a body is supposed to be invariant. According to Einstein, however, mass is a function of velocity. The greater the velocity the greater the mass. It is not quite correct, however, to say that mass increases with velocity. Rather, the mass of a body with respect to a certain frame of reference depends upon its velocity with respect to that frame of reference. At the same moment, then, a given body may have a certain mass with respect to one frame of reference, and a quite different mass with respect to another frame of reference. Let m be the mass of a body with respect to one frame of reference,

and m' the mass of the same body with respect to another frame of reference; let v be the velocity of one of these frames with respect to the other; and let c be the speed of light (which is assumed to be constant). Then $m' = m \div \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$. Inasmuch as the velocity of light is 186,000 miles per second, at ordinary velocities the fraction v^2/c^2 does not differ appreciably from 0. Consequently for ordinary velocities mass may be treated as constant. But when velocities approach the speed of light, as in the case of electrons, a variation in mass is observable. To make the principle concrete, if a particle of matter moves with a velocity of 161,000 miles per second, its mass is twice as great as when it is at rest or is moving at ordinary velocities.

Again, according to Einstein, *length* is not an absolute value. It too depends upon the frame of reference. To find the length of a rod which is moving (in the direction of its own length) with respect to a frame of reference, we multiply the length of the rod at rest by $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, where v is the velocity with which the rod is moving. Thus if v is again supposed to be 161,000 the length of the rod when moving is but one-half its length when at rest. (Here, of course, as in the previous example, the number 161,000 is chosen for reasons of convenience in calculation. If 186,000 is taken as the velocity of light, and these values are substituted in our formula for v and c , the result comes out evenly.)

In the third place, and strangest of all, *time* too is relative. It is meaningless to say that two events are *simultaneous*, or that one is *after* the other, unless we specify the frame of reference. For two given events might be simultaneous, if the earth is taken as the frame of reference; and the same events might occur one after the other if the sun be the frame of reference. Units of time, such as days, hours, or seconds, have no absolute significance. They must be measured by the motion of the earth or the hands of a clock. If a clock should move at the rate of 161,000 miles per hour,

time would proceed only half as fast as usual. If the clock should move away from the earth with a velocity equal to that of light, time would stand still. If a man could travel with the speed of light, he would not grow old, etc. Any hopes which we may have of finding a solution of the problem of longevity are dashed to the ground, however; for we learn that, according to Einstein, no material thing can quite equal the speed of light.

These modifications of our ordinary ideas of space and time are necessary, says Einstein, in order that we may retain two postulates, both of which are indispensable in physics:

(a) The principle that the laws of nature are independent of any particular observer or frame of reference.

(b) The principle of the constant velocity of light.²

It may seem to the layman that the physicist might modify one of his postulates, especially the second. But this the physicist is unwilling to do. For the principle of the constant velocity of light is firmly grounded experimentally, and is a basic assumption of the whole electromagnetic theory.

If we agree, for the sake of the argument, to regard space and time as relative, we are led to the concept of a four-dimensional world; that is, of a world which has as its dimensions length, breadth, thickness, and *time*. The essence of the new view consists in regarding these dimensions as entities which are, so to speak, on the same level, and are therefore interchangeable. If we protest that we are irresistibly impelled to think of *time* as a unique property of the world, as a somewhat wholly different from length or breadth or thickness, the relativist assures us that it is all a matter of accustoming ourselves to a new way of

² Limitations of space forbid a discussion of the famous experiment of Michelson and Morley. This experiment proves the impossibility of reconciling the postulates given above without *some* sort of revolutionary modification of our notions of space and time. Einstein contends that his theory offers the *simplest* solution of the difficulty. The reader is referred again to the books mentioned in the previous note.

thinking; that the difficulty is in the *novelty* of the concept rather than in any intrinsic absurdity. We are exhorted to stretch our imaginations just as people had to do under the prodding of Copernicus to grasp the idea that *down* is not a fixed direction. Indeed, we are told, Einstein is completing the revolution begun by Copernicus. If we may speak of the backwards-forwards direction, the right-left direction, and the up-down direction, it was, of course, known long before the time of Copernicus that the first two are interchangeable. What was a moment ago the front-to-back direction is now the side-to-side direction, if in the meantime I have turned my body through an angle of ninety degrees. For a long time, however, it was supposed that the up-to-down direction was unique. Just as many of us are now disposed to say that *time is time*, and nothing else, so people were disposed to say that down is down, and that, of course, everybody knows what down is. The discovery that the earth rotates on its axis led, however, to the assimilation of the vertical to the horizontal dimensions. What was *down* six hours ago is now east; and what *was* east is now *up*. Thus the up-down dimension is continually being interchanged with the horizontal dimensions. In technical language, it is a matter of indifference which planes are chosen as our "coördinates" or frame of reference, so long as each of these planes is perpendicular to each of the others. In much the same way, says the relativist, we are now required to assimilate time to the spatial dimensions. The conclusion to which we are led is that reality as such is neither spatial nor temporal, but is rather, so to speak, the stuff of which both space and time are made. For each observer splits up this non-spatial and non-temporal reality into space and time in his own way. And no way is any more *right* than another.

The view thus far discussed is known as the "special relativity theory." The formulas of the special theory hold on condition that one's systems of coördinates are in *uni-*

form motion of *translation*. That is, there is assumed to be neither *acceleration* nor *twisting*. Moreover, the special theory takes no account of *gravitation*. In the "general theory" Einstein waives these restrictions. We can not go into details. Suffice it to say that the universe is not only four-dimensional, as we have seen, but according to the general theory of relativity it is also non-Euclidean. Gravitation is not the manifestation of a "force of attraction"; it results from the nature of space. It is an affair of geometry. Material bodies are found to approach each other for the reason that in the neighborhood of matter space is "warped" or "curved."

At first blush, ideas of this sort may seem to be absurd. But we should constantly remind ourselves that the laws of Newton and the theorems of Euclid have no *a priori* validity. They apply to the real world *only in the degree that they are experimentally verified*. For example, Newton's first law—that a body tends to move with uniform velocity in a straight line—is a generalization from experience. It is not self-evident; neither can it be proved by *a priori* reasoning. There would be other possibilities, *a priori*, such as,—

- (1) A body tends to move in a uniform curve;
- (2) It tends to move with a uniformly accelerated velocity; or
- (3) It tends to preserve the same position. (This happens to be the view of Aristotle. Everything, he thought, will come to rest, unless some force keeps it moving.)

Now the point is that from the standpoint of pure reason, any of these principles is just as valid as the law of inertia formulated by Newton. If, then, the formulas of Einstein agree even better with the data of experience than the laws of Newton and the theorems of Euclid, the latter have no prescriptive right to acceptance.³

If we remember that time is to be included as one of the

³ Cf. Poincare, *Science and Hypothesis*, pp. 91 f.

dimensions of reality, the universe may, then, be described as "a four-dimensional continuum forming the surface of a sphere in five dimensions."⁴ This is a rather ponderous statement, to be sure. What it appears to mean is that the position of any element of the world is completely determined if *five* quantities are specified. Three of these "dimensions" may be thought of as spatial, one as temporal, and one, perhaps, as gravitational. The difficulty which most of us have with the idea of more than three dimensions seems to arise from the misunderstanding that dimensions must be at right angles to each other. But, as mathematicians use the term, this does not seem to be implied. A dimension is merely, quite literally, a *measurable*. A world in five-dimensions would be simply, as already said, a world in which five quantities must be specified. The world, if it is of this sort, can be described by means of equations of five variables. One may ask why, if we grant four or five dimensions, we might not as well grant six, seven, or any number. The answer is, that *only five are needed* to give a complete description of the physical properties of the world. Whether additional dimensions would be required to describe the spiritual aspects of the world, is another question.⁵

In conclusion, let us ask our third question. Thus far we have been trying merely to gain some understanding of the *meaning* of the theory of relativity. We must now inquire what follows if the hypothesis be accepted. In the *first place*, it follows that the world is *finite, yet unbounded*. If we think of space in the ordinary Euclidean manner, we are under the necessity of postulating an "always still more," even beyond the outermost limit of space. In other words, we cannot think of space as bounded in any direction. A straight line is infinite at both ends. If, however, we accept the theory of Einstein and his disciples, space is not Euclidean, but "curved." The phrase "curvature of space" is a convenient name for the idea that actual space bears the

⁴ Eddington, *Space, Time, and Gravitation*.

⁵ Cf. Pitkin, W. B., *The New Realism*, pp. 452 f.

same relation to Euclidean space that the surface of a sphere bears to a plane surface. If we imagine the surface of our planet to be a plane, we should have to suppose it to have definite ends,—definite “jumping off places,” so to speak,—or else we should have to regard it as infinite. There would be no other alternative. We discover, however, that the surface of our planet is not infinite, nor yet is there any end of the earth. This is possible because its surface is curved and not plane. The surface of the earth is finite in extent; yet it is unbounded. A line measured due east or due west on the surface of the earth, if sufficiently prolonged, will return to the point of origin. In the same way, say the disciples of Einstein, the universe is of finite extent. A straight line, if sufficiently prolonged, would return to the point of origin. For the universe, as we have seen, is to be thought of after the analogy of the surface of a sphere. Now estimates have been made, based upon the apparent quantity of *matter* in the universe; for the greater the amount of matter, the less the radius of curvature. And the radius of this sphere the surface of which is the universe is said to be of the order of 10^{13} times the distance of the earth from the sun. In 1000 million years, a ray of light would return to its startingpoint.*

Another implication of the Einstein theory, and the one which is of chief importance from the standpoint of philosophy, is that the world is *objectively real and independent* of the cognitive relation. This may seem to be a somewhat surprising statement; for it has usually been all too hastily inferred that the world of the theory of relativity must be a world of caprice and subjectivity. This inference has been suggested, it would seem, by the associations which cling to the word “relativity,” much more than by a study of the theory itself. For in the world as conceived by Einstein and his disciples there remain certain *absolutes*, certain facts which are in no wise dependent upon the observer.

* Eddington, *Space, Time, and Gravitation*, p. 161.

1. The "world-line" is the same for all observers. We have seen that there is a sense in which spatial and temporal relations are imposed upon reality by the observer. Each observer, we have said, splits up reality into space and time in his own way. Nevertheless that which is thus split up, that non-spatial and non-temporal stuff of which space and time are made, is what it is, regardless of the nature or position of the observer. The *difference* between two given elements of the world may be broken up in various ways into a *distance* in space and an *interval* of time; but the difference itself is something absolute, and independent of the manner in which it may thus be broken up. This absolute difference is what is called the "world-line."

2. An entity which is known technically as "action," and which may be defined as the product of density by space-time is the same for all observers.

3. *Rotation* is the same for all observers. Einstein himself is a little hazy on this point. According to Eddington, however, rotation is an absolute fact. It takes place with respect to the entire frame of "world-lines."

Thus the "theory of relativity" is not a theory of thorough-going relativity. It lends no support to *subjectivism* in the perennial conflict between the realistic and the subjectivistic theories of knowledge. On the contrary, realism is vindicated by Einstein. Indeed, the relativity theory is, precisely, an attempt to give a description of the world which shall transcend the view of any particular observer, or even, if that be possible, of all observers. The *Ding-an-Sich* of Kant, the *Unknowable* of Spencer, is therefore not completely unknown. This much at least we can say of it, it is that which fulfils the equations of Einstein.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.

II

MEDITATIONS

A. E. TRUXAL

When one approaches that period of his earthly life when nearly all of it lies behind him and he realizes that he will soon pass into the next sphere of existence he will most likely meditate upon many things more seriously than he did when he was in midst of the labors and cares, turmoils, and duties of his mission in the world. Such at least is my experience. From day to day my thoughts wander from this subject and that, dwelling upon them seriously and conscientiously. One subject that has lately engaged my meditations considerably is that of the supernatural. Much is being said these days about the importance of the supernatural and about the danger of losing faith in it. The question has arisen in my mind: What is the supernatural in distinction from the natural? I recall the conception long entertained that the universe of heavenly bodies including the earth with all that there is therein constitutes the natural; and that heaven, the abode of God and His angels, a place separate from the physical universe, is the supernatural. And further when God or His angels enter the sphere of the natural and bring about things in it, they are supernatural transactions. This conception grew out of the idea that the earth is a large flat body, the main body of the world, and that heaven is above and beyond the sun, moon, and stars. The idea of such a duality no longer appeals to my mind or heart. God is one God, and I believe that the great world which He has created and preserves is one world; and to this one world belong heaven and earth, the natural and the supernatural. There may be, and no doubt are, many different spheres and conditions and departments

in this world. There are many mansions in the Father's house. If we regard the whole world as the Father's house then the different spheres and departments would be the mansions in it; and the earth may be considered as one of these mansions. But what then is the supernatural in this great world? God is the supernatural, absolutely, abundantly, and perfectly; and the forces and powers that proceed from Him whether they be creative, preserving, or destroying are supernatural forces and powers producing supernatural results. That power which creates and maintains the great universe with all that it contains is a supernatural power. Back of and underneath the material universe is the spiritual universe in which the supernatural forces are operative. The natural is the outward expression of the supernatural. The supernatural is primal and fundamental without which the natural could not exist. God is "above all and through all and in all." He is above all and separate from it in His personality. He is not identical with the world, but He works in and through it. Here in this great universe, with its myriads of suns and systems, a world in its immensity transcending the powers of human conception, created by the Almighty and upheld and preserved by Him by means of a system of laws which the largest minds can but vaguely grasp, here I find an illimitable world of the supernatural. In and through it I see the light of God's wisdom and the might of His power. Nature could not create such a world, and natural laws could not sustain it if those laws were not livingly connected with the will of God from which they derive their energy and power. God is above all through all and in all. Some one may raise the objection that these are pantheistic conceptions. But that does not worry me. The only question that seriously concerns me is, are my apprehensions and judgments true? I believe they are and find much comfort from them.

The most important thing we find in the earth is life: three kinds of life, vegetable life, animal life, and human

life. We are want to call life under these different forms as natural life. But is it simply natural? What is life? Who can define it? Man has analyzed all kinds of living objects; he has studied the plant, the animal, and man in the effort to find life, but it has always eluded his search. He has discovered all the material elements of which living beings are composed. The chemist has supposed that if these elements were combined in proper proportions life could be produced. But his efforts have invariably been futile and no doubt always will be. Life can not be accounted for naturally. Life comes from life and is supernatural in its origin. It is maintained and developed by the divine power working in it. If plant life began with a single living germ and developed by a process of evolution into a vast number of species and varieties and myriads of individuals, as most likely was the case, it was the dynamic power of God that produced the evolution. Environment and the energy of the fittest no doubt constituted favorable conditions for the development, but in my opinion, they could not have produced it. The indwelling power of God was and continues to be the efficient cause of it. It is the supernatural that maintains the vegetable kingdom. Man may plow and sow and cultivate but he has no power to cause a single stalk of grain to grow; that power is in the seed lodged there by the wisdom and creative act of the Almighty, and is maintained by Him. The living connection of the divine with the life of the vegetable kingdom is never severed.

And if there was an evolution from vegetable life to animal life it was accomplished because God was above and through and in the process. And if the animal kingdom was the result of a process by which the higher forms of animal life were developed gradually from the lower forms until the highest animal was produced that process was initiated and sustained throughout by the creator and preserver of all things. The fact that God works in the creation and maintenance of life according to a nicely adjusted system

of laws does not detract from His wisdom and power, but adds to them. It would not redound to the power and glory of God if He operated in a sporadic or chaotic manner. Such a course would inevitably result in confusion and destruction. The system of laws complementing, checking, and balancing each other in the universe by which the countless multitude of heavenly bodies are kept in their appointed order and course, and the system of laws by which life is created and maintained in the earth are marvellous in our eyes and declare the glory of God. The development of animal life as a whole, the development of the individual from the small germ of life into a mature being, and the various metamorphoses that take place can not be accounted for except by the recognition of the life-quickening and life-sustaining power of God operating in the process. No other hypothesis will satisfy the deepest intuitions of the soul and the fundamental longings of the human heart. It is God above all, through all, and in it all that alone gives meaning to the natural world. It is the supernatural coming to external expression through the natural.

When we come to the study of man the first thing that confronts us is his close and intimate relation to the animal. Physically, the similarity is general and decisive. Respiration, the circulation of the blood, the digestion, and assimilation of food, the vital organs in general, procreation, are all practically the same in the animal and in man. Physically, man has been classified with the animal. So far as the soul of man is concerned we find traces of it also in the animal. The love of the mother for her offspring, the affection of some animals for each other, and especially for man, gratitude for favors done them, resentment and the spirit of revenge for injuries done them, deception practiced, the exercise of reason and mechanical skill in the construction of nests and in the provision of food for themselves and their young, these things constitute traces of psychology and are an adumbration of the fully developed powers in

man. When and how God created man I do not know. The account of creation in Genesis can not be relied on for information on the subject. That for various reasons can not be accepted as literal history. That man and the world are much older than that account would make them has been clearly established. That all things were created in six days no scholar of the present day believes. A generation or two ago some commentators defined the six days as meaning so many periods or ages of time. That is a mere make-shift. There is nothing in the record to indicate anything else than days as commonly understood. The account of man's creation out of the dust of the ground and of woman's creation from man's rib can not be received as literal history. There are too many marks of the myth and legend to those accounts. They may be representations of the folk lore at the time, but can not be regarded as a divine revelation of man's creation. The record of Genesis however contains two very important truths: first, that God is the creator of the whole world with all the creatures that are therein; and second, that He created man in His own image and made him partaker of His own life. He breathed into him the breath of life. His body was from below, but his soul from above. But how and when did God create man? No one can answer that question dogmatically. We can, in the language of the Bible say: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; but when that beginning was and how that creation was effected we do not know. Man may be the result of a development from below, the product of an evolution from the lower orders of life, as evolutionists claim. I know of no other hypothesis that satisfies all the facts in the case as well as that of evolution. And until something more satisfactory is discovered I must accept the theory of evolution. But my contention is that by whatever mode man was created it was God who created him. Whatever the process it was initiated and maintained throughout by the mind and might of the Lord. And

somehow God endowed him with His own life, made him partaker of His life and bearer of His image. God is the father, man is the child. The mode of man's creation may be unknown, but the result is not. By experience and meditation we know that we are related to the divine Being and under Him must work out our mission. From the beginning to the end of the world all men everywhere live and move and have their being in God. Back of and underneath the boundless universe I see God, back of and within every form of life upon earth I see God creating and sustaining it by the might of His power. God above all and through all and in all. Thus I see before me a great world of the supernatural of which the natural is but its outward manifestation.

When we come to consider the history of mankind we enter a new sphere of the divine operations. Here we meet with the freedom of man's will, and that introduces a new factor. Yet mankind belongs to God's creation and constitutes a sphere in which He exercises His powers. The Hebrew nation is the first to demand our attention, though it was not the first nor the greatest nation of antiquity. Before it and besides it there were other and greater nations, and God had something to do with them, though I do not know what that something was. Of Israel we can speak more definitely. Abraham with his faith and works, Moses with his accomplishments, David with his services, and the prophets with their messages were inspired of God. The prophets, priests, and kings, the chequered history of the people of Israel, their religion with its various forms and ceremonies, constituted the natural element in the career of that nation, but above and through and in all of these human factors was the Lord speaking and working. It was the living energy of the supernatural in the natural that gave to that nation its meaning and significance. But the natural bulked much larger than the supernatural. The Jewish nation with all that belonged to it from Abraham to

John the Baptist was outwardly immensely more human than divine, and yet the divine was its sustaining life. The life principle in the tree is very small compared with its trunk, branches and leaves, and yet the life is the essential part of the tree. The branches and the main body of the tree may be cut off but the principle of life will remain in what is left. So the natural in the history and accomplishments of the children of Israel was outwardly the largest part of it, but it was the supernatural though small and invisible, that enabled that people to accomplish God's purposes by them.

The supernatural came to full and complete manifestation in Jesus of Nazareth. In Him the divine pervaded the human thoroughly, and because of the divine in Him He became the Savior of the world. But there was a natural side to His manifestation. No matter how begotten His conception, gestation, and birth of the Virgin Mary all took place in the natural way. He was nourished at His mother's breast and grew as other children grow. He ate, drank, and slept as other men do. He was endowed with reason, feelings, and will. He was grieved at heart and suffered pain. All those things in Him which were common to all men constituted the natural in Him. But He was more than natural. He manifested the supernatural. His character, words, and works revealed the divine in Him. As to His character He challenged His enemies and friends to show any sin in Him, and that challenge has sounded through the world for nineteen hundred years and has never been answered. Nicodemus, a learned and conscientious man, said to Jesus: No man can do these miracles that thou doest unless God be with him. The officers who went to arrest Him returned empty with the report: Never man spake like this man. And it is the testimony to-day of all who have studied Jesus that no person ever lived the life that He lived, performed the works He performed, and spake the truth as He spoke it. He was a divine-human person. He revealed God the Father to the world. He

manifested the supernatural as it is nowhere else manifested. And as His apostles and evangelists and their successors have gone forth from generation to generation down to the present day and preached Jesus and His Gospel the results produced in the lives of men, women and children, and in human society have been such as to reveal the presence and power of the Lord with their words and works. Jesus and His Gospel are represented by the church and the Lord is above and through and in the work of the church and seeks to accomplish great and glorious things for the children of men by her. It is by the supernatural working with the natural in the church that the world is to be saved.

But what has become of the Jews? St. Paul was converted by the appearance of the risen Christ to him. Like the disciples of the Lord he placed his faith and hope on the risen and living Messiah, and like them he believed that He would soon return again from the sphere of glory to establish the Kingdom which He had preached and for which Jew and Christian were looking. St. Paul obeyed the call of the Master to become an apostle to the Gentiles and he devoted his life and energies in preaching the Gospel to the Gentile cities in Asia Minor and Southeastern Europe, and he established a large number of congregations. But in all his labors he never lost his interest in his own people. He was an Israelite, and a Pharisee. He believed Israel to be God's chosen people. The promises were given to them, and he thought that they ought to be the first to come into the Kingdom of Christ. The Gospel was first for the Jews, and then for the Gentile. He expected the apostles in Jerusalem to gather his people into the fold. And when he visited a city he at once sought out the synagogue of the Jews and preached the Gospel to them. They were given the first opportunity and some of them were converted unto Christ. But he also labored among the Gentiles. In his mind the Jews were to be the first in the Kingdom, and the Greeks second. But as the years passed by he discovered

by painful experience that the Jews were set against Christ and the Gospel. He was beaten and stoned and maltreated in various ways by the Jews. And the apostles in Jerusalem were meeting with a similar experience. The Jews were refusing to receive the Gospel of Christ. St. Paul's congregations were growing but mainly by additions from the Gentiles. The apostle now realized that the Gentiles were the first to come into the Kingdom, and that he was compelled to change his expectations. Has God cast away his people? God forbid. God has not cast away his people whom he foreknew. But God's course in saving them is different from what he had at first supposed. Some of the branches of the good olive tree have been broken off and the branches of the wild olive grafted in. But the good branches, which are the natural ones, shall again be grafted into their own olive tree. Blindness in part has happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and then shall all Israel be saved. That the Gentiles should come into the Kingdom first and his own kinsmen according to the flesh second was a mysterious dealing of the Lord God. His people were the "Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the services of God and the promises; whose are the fathers and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever," and why they stand out is a mystery to the apostle who so earnestly desired their salvation. Hence he exclaimed, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out."

The apostle died a martyr's death before "the fullness of the Gentiles" had come in and before "Israel was saved," and before the Lord's return with power and great glory to establish His Kingdom. In his early ministry he evidently expected to witness in his day the glorious return of the Saviour; but as his end approached he looked forward to his departure to be with Christ.

Were the dealings of God with the Jews a mystery to St. Paul in his day, His dealings with them from that time until now are mysterious to us. In the year 70 the walls of Jerusalem were cast down, the temple razed to the ground, thousands of the Jews were slain and the balance driven to the four winds of the earth. Since then they have lived in every land and dwelt almost among every people. They have been shamefully persecuted and cruelly oppressed. Yet they have lived through it all, prospered and maintained their racial individuality. At the present time there is a movement among them to gain possession of their original country of Palestine and become a nation again. Whether this effort will be successful the future alone can determine. A portion of their people throughout the world are unfavorable to the movement and the Arabs and others dwelling in Palestine refuse to leave the country. But whether the enterprise will fail or succeed the question is: What does God mean to accomplish by His people? I can not believe that He has cast them out of His family, but do believe that His purpose is that they shall learn some important lesson and become a benefit to the world. But the ways of the Lord are past finding out. And we are confronted by other peoples besides the Jews. There are the Arabians, the Indians, the Chinese, the Japanese, and the Mongolians, all of the Asiatic continent. Some of these have had a long history. And they all belong to God's great family of mankind. I doubt whether God has any chosen people. They are all His people. Some, no doubt, are more valuable to Him than others because they respond better to His overtures and are more helpful to Him for carrying out the purposes of His wisdom and goodness. Some nations may perish because they have fulfilled their mission under God or have failed to do so. What has He accomplished by all the several nations of the earth, and what does He purpose to accomplish by them in the future? That the divine mind means to subserve some beneficial ends by them I have no doubt, but those ends are

concealed within the secrets of His purposes. My faith in God and my conception of Him cause me to believe that mankind as a whole, from the lowest tribes to the highest and most civilized nations, is under the general supervision of the Almighty, that He is above them all, and through, and in them all. And any nation that regards itself as the highest and best people of God, despising all others, is apt to come to humiliation and shame. The German people regarded themselves and perhaps so regard themselves yet as the greatest and best people under God. The English have a very high opinion of themselves, and the Americans place a supervalue upon themselves. "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also in the things of others," that is good advice for the individual and equally good also for the nation. He that exalteth himself shall be abased. The hour has come, it seems to me, when the nation, no matter how high it may stand in its own estimation, and as a matter of fact, is challenged to order its course with a wise reference to the well being of all the nations of the earth. The time has arrived when narrow conceptions must give way to conceptions world-wide in extent; when the thoughts of men must be world-thoughts; when the efforts of men must be directed to the welfare of the whole human family. Heaven and earth belong to God; the boundless universe belongs to God; the vegetable and animal kingdoms belong to God; mankind in all its length and breadth in time and space belongs to God; all the races, tribes, and individuals belong to God; and He is above all and through all and in all. His government, purposes, and works transcend our comprehension. In regard to them we can express our feelings in the words of the apostle, "O the depth both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding! For who has known the mind of the Lord. For of him and through him and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever, Amen."

SOMERSET, PA.

III

CHRISTIAN TRUTHS WHICH HAVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE EVANGELISTIC APPEAL FOR TO-DAY

ARTHUR C. THOMPSON

Into the background of this study, we place three thoughts.

The first thought is, that humanity is under the master hand of change. "To change and change, and never rest," is the law. Thereby an endless variety shows itself in all phases of human life. In the realm of religion, change creates a world ever new, and the study of christian experience has an interest always new and fresh.

The second thought is, that the hand of change is moved by a force which makes for growth and development in the spiritual life of man. The race and the individual share alike in the progress, ordered as childhood, youth, maturity, age, and immortality. Mankind is on the upgrade toward those tablelands "where God is moon and sun."

"They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast with truth."

The third thought is, that there is a law of reaction or rebound in the religious as well as the other sides of life. The mind and the soul of man live in a temperate zone which abhors extremes. The intensity of Summer or Winter must give way at the most exaggerated moment to the influence of the other. While the tide of progress moves upward, each challenging wave must struggle with the one which spent its force highest on the beach of human progress. Yet each day and generation may rejoice in its own contribution to the advance of the true, the beautiful, the good, the strong, and the Christ-like.

Counter-forces have great significance in religion. Op-

posing heresies wrote the creeds of the church; at least, chose the articles which should be numbered in the creed. The nature of the world's sin and doubt molded the gospels of the early evangelists of the church, as the sickness of the patient decides the prescription of the physician. Jesus is ever the great physician for human ills, and with him, the church also serves the sin-sick world. Well might we ask, what are the prescriptions of gospel truth most needed and effective to save the men of our day?

The answer is not so simple as it might at first seem. Merely to reply that we have a scheme of theology to be proclaimed is not sufficient. These doctrines are the product of the past; and each christian doctrine has had its experience with the principle of reaction from its own extremes, with the recoil of the world's sin. There is also a growing revelation of the gospel in accord with new human experience. All these unite to determine the message of the preacher of the gospel in every generation.

The gospel of the effective evangelists is the revelation of the living truth for their day, and is in keeping with the most acute needs of humanity at that period. The messages of divine truth are spoken in the language of the hearer, necessarily so. The prophets of ancient Israel delivered God's messages to their own time, and suited to those whom they addressed. So every age shapes, through its needs the gospel of Christ's salvation. Let us illustrate this. The saving and reviving gospel has had many and varied emphases.

Looking back into the middle ages, it is interesting to note that in the time of St. Francis of Assisi, worldliness and wealth had so captivated the church, that it left the world of men ground down by intolerable wrongs, the prey of the powerful, and the dupe of the ecclesiastic. Men lived in a state of terror unsoothed by those higher consolations of christianity which change the way of thorns into the way of the cross. When St. Francis preached love of poverty

instead of love of mammon, and holiness instead of sin, the spirit of his generation responded gladly and took refuge in the gospel of the Kingdom of Christ.

Savonarola in Italy and Knox in Scotland were the focus and the heroes of two great revivals, in which the preaching was of the nature of that of the old prophets of Israel, linking national and civic righteousness with the spirit of true religion in such manner, that the religious movement for spiritual emancipation through the evangelical gospel became a challenge to the Roman church fortified by temporal power.

Luther's preaching to multitudes grown distrustful of the efficacy of the church's salvation, had for its central idea, "Christ our righteousness, that he might be Christ, our strength and sanctification." The coöperation of that inspired preacher and a spirit-moved generation changed the course of history of the human mind and soul for all time to come.

Jonathan Edwards, at the time of the Great Awakening in America in the 18th century aroused the people of his day by preaching of "judgment to come." Its vivid portrayal in his sermon on "Sinners in the Hand of an Angry God," is the classic message of his time.

Whitfield's gospel was a variation of two key-notes: "Man is a sinner but may be forgiven: Man is immortal and will inherit heaven and hell"; preached, however, with more of the spirit of compassion and human interest than by Doctor Edwards.

Wesley continued the same in England and America, with an added stress upon the experience of the heart of man in his conversion; and the personal realization within himself of the joy, peace, and purifying power of Christianity. He developed the thought of the heart-side of man's relation to Christ.

A strange development of emotional excesses and physical reactions took place in connection with revivals in Ken-

tucky about the beginning of the 19th century, and continued for a number of years. Charles G. Finney, in this period following the Revolutionary war, presented a contrastive message, in the preaching of morals thrilled through with religion. His legal mind laid hold upon the law. His christian experience under the Holy Ghost, touched his heart with the Gospel; and in that skeptical day, led by his appeal to the conscience, multitudes confessed Christ as Lord.

The middle of the nineteenth century was marked by preaching which returned to the simplicity of the gospel, and it became in the lips of the leaders of the church about New York and then through the rest of America, the good tidings of salvation to over 500,000 souls.

The Christian gospel coming to deal with evolution and the rise of the era of science, gave to England, Henry Drummond; and to America, Henry Ward Beecher. Drummond was himself a great, loved, and effective evangelist among the students and young men of England and America. Beecher not only interpreted evolution as being God's plan of working in the universe, but also proclaimed the Fatherhood of God and his love toward his erring children.

The latter thought of the love of God became the living soul of Dwight L. Moody; and he drew for a sin-cursed and sin-driven humanity, a picture of the face of God in which the smile of a father's love, and the tear of his compassion, swallowed up the frown of his stern judgment of sinners. Moody built anew for the wandering soul, a home in the heart of God, and the prodigal returned to the Father through Jesus Christ, the Way.

Our time is named an age of transition in many of its aspects. There appear to be no outstanding and pronounced emphases in spiritual thinking; and yet there are moving currents which seem about to determine the course for the future.

This generation in the Protestant church has its training during a time when denominational peculiarities were her-

alded from the pulpit. These were made the shibboleth of the acceptance of Christianity and the narrow ground of the hope of salvation. The over-stressing of peculiarities resulted in a real loss to the several churches. A generation was raised up without an appreciation of the life-wide application of the Gospel of Christ and its purpose of saving man in all his relations in time and eternity. The error of this method revealed itself in its social divisiveness, and religious exclusiveness. It became true that men, larger in christian sympathies than the denominations allowed, were many times untouched by organized christianity. Abraham Lincoln is a case in point. Many also, whose minds were puzzled by denominational non-essentials stood undecided between denominations and likewise outside the church. Deep-seeing leaders of Christianity—some of them from among the laity—began the great organized interdenominational community movements for preaching an undenominational gospel. They struck a responsive chord, and they had marvelous success in bringing men to decision. How else could it be when the untrammelled gospel was presented in the spirit of brotherhood and earnest solicitation for men needing salvation by Jesus Christ? A source of partial failure bringing about the practical abandonment of this method which challenged cities and communities, was found in the fact that the appeal to follow Christ was given under circumstances so different from the conditions in which converts were to follow and serve Christ in the local church, that many soon grew cold and fell by the wayside.

This period of transition, with all its uncertainty of direction is moving the evangelists toward the plain and balanced fundamentals of Christianity; yet each of these is molded and modified by the peculiarities of to-day. This thought leads us to choose a few of the most evidently thus affected.

1. Let us name the appeal of the doctrine of the person of Christ. In a series of evangelistic services held in the local church this year different ministers preaching each

evening, the much larger proportion of sermons strongly exalted the Christ as the Son of God. Since Dr. Percy Stickney Grant aroused the church and those outside with his teaching which tends to discount the deity of Christ, one would think that Arius and Athanasius lived again in a multiplied progeny, and had begun their struggle anew. The problem is very real. Dr. Grant is the spokesman for many men, and the pulpit is called upon to gather the world into that upper room where Thomas exclaimed, as he saw the wounds of the resurrected Christ, "My Lord and My God." A letter received from Doctor R. A. Torrey asserts the facts of the resurrection of Christ and his deity as the very foundation of his evangelistic appeal. In this he follows Peter and the New Testament evangelists.

2. The appeal of Retribution and Hell. An exaggerated result of the preaching of the love of God in the last decades is seen in a lack of conviction of sin on the part of the people. It should not be thus, that persons should therefore become careless and profane; but there seems to be a feeling prevalent among men, that God is easy with transgressors. This may partially have resulted from the emphasis of scientists upon natural laws, which takes away the force of the fact that sin is a personal matter between the soul and God, as well as a physical and social development. Sensing this, "Billy" Sunday has proclaimed the reality of Hell, the inevitable punishment of sin, the personal devil, and the wrath of God. The people have responded in great numbers. If retribution is a fact, it should be well known; and while this truth is not the gospel, its realization is a preparation for the acceptance of Him, "who taketh away the sin of the world." The breakdown of the ten commandments during the war robbed the Christian nations of a conscience tutored by Christian sanctions.

3. The appeal of the Atonement. The revelations of God to the heart of humanity are a response to the capacity to receive them. Significant are those expressions, "I have

many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now"; again, it was "in the fulness of time" that Jesus came. Before the war, the doctrine of the atonement met many questions in the minds of many men. But the war itself brought the experience of something akin to the cross of Christ to the soldier in the trenches. "Men actually found out, what it meant to suffer for others and to have others suffer and die for them." "We must remember that the preaching of the cross has suffered from lack of experience in the hearers as well as lack of passion in those who preached." The cross of Christ is the gospel of a man laying down his life for his friends. Calvary has had a new birth in men's hearts, and the war-torn world has a new vision of the cross:

"Without a city wall,
Where the dear Lord was crucified
Who died to save us all."

Christ is still true in his saying, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

4. The appeal of eternity with its associated interpretation of time and death in relation to life, is effective as ever in the message of all the evangelists of to-day. The thought of immortality lifts life above low levels of the flesh and temporal allurements. The fleetness of time and the hurrying approach of spiritually decisive death, and judgment, have their positive bearings upon decisions for Christ. The pre-millennialists use the idea of the second coming of Christ with great persuasive power. A volume of sermons preached in a series of evangelistic services by Doctor George W. Truett, strongly urges throughout the whole series of varied gospel truths presented, the bearing of time upon the acceptance of Christ on the part of the hearers—"Now is the day of salvation."

5. The appeal of the personal God. The influence of the study of natural law by the scientists, the discovery of the principles of psychology working in the individual and in

the group, call for a new Henry Drummond, a new Charles G. Finney, to proclaim the gospel of Christ in his person and work, for the salvation of men lost in the mazes of new truth revealed, but spiritually unorganized. At the present time the worship of the laws of nature on the part of the scholars of highly developed mind, might be classed with the fetish worship of the crude races. The laws of nature for the learned have taken the place of the simple objects of nature in the reverence of primitive men; and this has developed into a gigantic and modern idolatry. It calls for the reassertion of the God of creation and providence, and of the immanence of the Divine Spirit in the experiences of men.

6. The appeal of Stewardship. Some one has suggested that the crass materialism and mammonism of to-day will bring a reaction resulting in the christian consecration of possessions, and that men of the new generation will be acknowledged stewards ready and willing to give an account to God of their stewardship in material things. The recent conversion of a man of wealth and worldly ambitions, who like Zacchaeus vowed to give one tenth of his income to the Lord, is an example, an arrow which reveals which way the winds of the divine and renewing spirit are blowing. The world to be saved unto Christ needs to be saved from greed.

7. The appeal of heroism in confession. In every successful campaign of the present there is an appeal to heroism in confession. This is a development of spiritual individualism, calling for the breaking of personal ties which have bound one with the world and its people. It is primarily selfish. I should not wonder that the new preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom of God, the reign of Jesus Christ in the hearts of men, and the thought of unselfish service, would eventually move men and women to accept Jesus Christ in the spirit of unselfish love to him and their fellowmen—saints and sinners alike; to take Jesus' attitude toward Publicans and Sinners. This can not become real,

however, until the body of christians themselves are living and glowing examples of that spirit; until men so love God with all the heart, mind, soul and strength, and their neighbor as themselves, that others will yearn to share the new chivalry of the Kingdom of God.

8. The appeal of the New Theology. I have searched for the evangel of the new theology, and have been charmed by its exaltation of the life and personality of Jesus; but fear that it does not take sufficient cognizance of the nature of the human heart. One is scarcely born naturally into the christian life beside the manger in Bethlehem, to be trained by the holy example of the Christ and his gracious teaching. Instead, the man with sin in his life and upon his heart feels the need of first bowing at the foot of Calvary's cross, and receiving forgiveness, thus to enter into that school of the blessed Master which tutors the soul in the virtues of the Son of God. The new theology in its present spirit seems to be related to that of Proverbs in the matter of wisdom, to the Decalogue in devotion to the natural laws of the spiritual world, to the Psalms in adoration and reverence for the divine. Its spirit is developing great prophets with helpful messages; but we must look to the future for the proclamation of its gospel for the salvation of the sin-sick soul.

9. Evangelism and the heathen religions. The most marvelous developments in evangelism are seen on the foreign mission fields. There the boundless resources of the gospel—like to our Lord healing all manner of diseases—are realized in meeting and overcoming every obstacle presented by sins common to humanity and the varied bias and developments of the non-christian religions. Kanimori of Japan preaches God, and wins men from idolatry; preaches sin, and teaches men their guilt before God; preaches Christ, the Savior, and men yield in thousands to his gospel.

The evangelists of to-day who have effectively preached the gospel, reveal their diagnosis of the need of humanity in the order of presenting the gospel.

I have a note from Doctor R. A. Torrey, which says: "In answer to your question, would say: The truths I find most effective are, first of all, the truth of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This was the one truth upon which the Apostles rang the changes. It is the foundation of my faith, and what gives power to my preaching. In connection with the resurrection, of course, I emphasize the Deity of Jesus Christ as proven by the resurrection, and the majesty of his person; and the consequent awful guilt of rejecting Him. Then I emphasize the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ; it comes in directly or indirectly in a very large share of my sermons. I also dwell largely upon the gratitude we owe to God and his Son Jesus Christ because of what Jesus did, and suffered, and sacrificed for us. Isa. 53: 5, 6. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

Doctor R. C. Zartman, our Synodical evangelist in Eastern Synod, of the Reformed Church, practically follows the outline of the Heidelberg Catechism—patterned after the Epistle to the Romans—in preaching first, of sin; then of redemption through the death of Jesus; then, of gratitude which makes saved men willing and ready to live unto Him.

Doctor Ozora S. Davis, President of Chicago Theological Seminary, has outlined a series of evangelistic sermons, giving the first division of the series to the fact of the living Christ; the second, to the possibility of the soul finding its complete realization in allegiance to Christ; the third, outlining the way of penitence, faith, loyalty, and obedience and sacrifice and service as members of the Kingdom of God.

I think that there is a stirring up of the Holy Spirit within the heralds of the gospel, in an aroused compassion for a world of men groping for the light and yearning for a fuller

life. In a land where much of the irreligion is Christianity grown luke-warm and cold; and where many of the lost are those who have wandered from the safety of the fold of Christ, our heart cries out to God that he may take coal from off the altar and touch the lips of his servants with a message true to truth and warm with the love of Christ for men. May the Holy Spirit so appear in cloven tongues that each man in sin may hear the wonderful works of God in his own language. Whether God will anoint anew his ordained men, or will call, as he has often done, some one of those laymen who seem to live nearest of all to the heart of truth for humanity, may we, according to our guidance and power, ever make it the purpose of our service in the gospel of the Son of God, to "be made all things to all men, that we might by all means save some."

TAMAQUA, PA.

IV

THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE REVISION

DAVID S. SCHAFF

The American Committee on the Revision of the Authorized Version of the English Bible began its work of revision October 4, 1872. The fiftieth anniversary of this occurrence was commemorated here and there by churches and theological institutions, the most notable service being held in the Brick Church, New York City, November 26, 1922, under the auspices of a large and influential committee of ministers and laymen. The American Bible Society was represented by its general Secretary, Dr. Haven; Dr. John H. Finley, of the *New York Times*, presided and the Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana, made the chief address. An interesting feature of the program was the presentation of a Bible by Dr. Haven to the Rev. Dr. Rufus M. Miller, D.D., to be deposited in the Schaff Building, now being erected in Philadelphia.

The Revised Version, having in mind especially the New Testament, has accredited itself as an accurate rendering. It is used in Sabbath School Helps, though recent opposition to such use has not been wanting. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1922 was obliged by some protest to repeat its sanction of such public use. In theological seminaries its use predominates though it is not uniform. From answers to enquiries made to eleven seminaries, Baptist, Episcopalian, Congregational, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Reformed, it appears that six use the Revised Version in chapel and classroom exclusively, four both versions and one the Authorized Version only.

As a book for the usual English reader the objection

drawn from the style remains the same as it was forty years ago. This objection has recently found notable expression from that high authority in English literature, Professor William Lyon Phelps, in his *Human Nature in the Bible*. The Revisers—British and American—had no expectation that the Revised Version would suddenly supersede King James' Version. If accepted at all it would be, as was the case with King James' Version by a gradual process. To the end of their careers Bishop Westcott in England and Dr. Philip Schaff in America persisted in the judgment that the Revised Version would ultimately come into general use. The ground they took was that the less accurate translation would give way to the more accurate one.

Upon the merits of the Revised Version and its claim to be a substitute for the Version of 1611 it is not the writer's purpose to dwell. His concern is to review the Revision as an important chapter in the religious history of the 19th century and more especially to set forth the share American scholars had in the work. In doing the latter it is fair to say that the writer enjoyed some exceptional advantages, having served for several years as amanuensis of the American New Testament Company and having access through Dr. Philip Schaff not only to the documents but to other inside history of the Committee. No member of the Committee survives. The last member, ex-President Dwight, died in 1917.

THE INCEPTION OF THE REVISION MOVEMENT.—The official action from which the Revised English Bible ultimately proceeded was taken in the Convocation of Canterbury, 1870. During the twenty years preceding this date the conviction had been growing among English scholars. Dr. Trench, archbishop of Dublin, had written: "However, we may let Revision alone, it will not let us alone." About the same time Professor Plumptre in his article "Authorized Versions" in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, 1863, expressed the judgment that the revision of King James' Ver-

sion should not be delayed much longer. The main considerations out of which this conviction grew were the following:

1. A Greek text of the New Testament was in existence based upon manuscripts and other evidence not known in 1611. The full Sinaitic Manuscript had been found by Tischendorf, 1859, and the Vatican Manuscript had been made accessible about the same time. The changes in the Greek text necessitated by these and other discoveries were incorporated in their editions of the New Testament prepared by Lachmann and Tischendorf in Germany and Tregelles and Westcott and Hort in England and a host of critical commentators as, for example, Meyer in Germany, Alford, Lightfoot and Ellicott in England, and the contributors to the Schaff-Lange commentary in America. One of these changes and perhaps the most notable one is the omission from I John V: 7 of the words "there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." These words, not found in the oldest Greek manuscripts, were without doubt inserted by some pious advocate of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

2. During the two centuries and more between 1611 and 1870 certain English words used in King James' Version had changed their meaning. For example, the passage "Give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist" means "Give me the head of John the Baptist in a platter immediately." The word "prevent" in 1611 was used in the sense of "precede," as in I Thess. IV: 15; "We who are alive shall not prevent them which are asleep," where the meaning is that we shall not go before them which are asleep. The word translated "let" meant "hinder," as in Rom. I: 13 where Paul, writing that he had wanted to go to Rome, but "had been let hitherto," meant that he had been "hindered hitherto." The translation, "Take no thought for the morrow," Matt. VII: 27, 28, 31, 34, com-

pletely misrepresented, as Dr. Lightfoot said, our Lord's meaning. His words were an injunction not against provident care and foresight, but against anxious worry—"be not anxious for the morrow."

3. Actual cases of mistranslation in the Authorized Version were due to mistakes in the understanding of the original Greek words and especially of the Greek tenses. The child, called a lunatic was an epileptic. When the father said, "If thou canst do anything for us, help us," Christ did not reply "If thou canst believe: all things are possible to him that believeth," but "If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth." The dying thief did not say "When thou comest into thy kingdom," but "when thou comest in thy kingdom." The one "fold and one shepherd," John X: 26, is in the Greek one "flock and one shepherd." What the Lord meant in the parable when he said "occupy till I come" was "trade till I come," Luke 19: 13. There were no churches to be robbed when the apostle is made to speak of "robbers of churches." He spoke of robbing temples, Acts 19: 37. In many cases the Greek definite article was ignored in the A. V. It was not the talking with "the woman" of Samaria that aroused the surprise of the disciples, it was Christ's talking "with a woman." As for the rendering of the tenses by the Authorized translators, Dr. Riddle said that "in hundreds of instances they rendered the Greek Aorist by the English perfect and this is almost always incorrect."

These and other considerations weighed upon the minds of English scholars to whom fidelity to the Word of God seemed to make it, if not imperative, certainly desirable that King James' Version should be submitted to a revision. Discontentment with King James' Version had often expressed itself from the time the Westminster Assembly and the Long Parliament 1643-48 seriously debated the preparation of a new Version and Rev. Robert Gell of London in 1659 evolved a volume of 800 pages to show the defects of the Version of 1611.

An altogether different aspect was given to Revision by the advance during the 19th century of Greek scholarship, the intensive study of the Greek text of the New Testament starting with Mill in England and Bengel in Germany and, as had been said, the recovery of a more accurate and reliable Greek text as compared with the Beza text used by the fifty-four translators of King James' Version. The growing feeling in favor of revision first found official expression in a motion offered by Canon Selwyn in the Convocation of Canterbury, 1856. The motion failing, the Reverend Earnest Hawkins, Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, brought together five Anglican divines, including Dean Alford, Dr. Ellicott, and Dr. Moberly, later Bishop of Salisbury, who issued in 1857, as a specimen of what might be done, *the Authorized Version of St. John's Gospel, Revised by Five Clergymen*. This was followed by revisions of several of Paul's Epistles. About this time, 1859, Dr. Trench issued his pamphlet setting forth reasons and proposals for revision. Ten years later, February 10, 1870, a resolution was passed in the Convocation of Canterbury, appointing a Committee to report "upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament," and whether the correction of plain and clear errors should be by way of "marginal notes or otherwise." The Committee's report, adopted in Convocation, May 3, 1870, called for the appointment of a Revision Committee, declaring that "no new translation of the Bible was contemplated or any alteration of the language of King James' Version except where in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary." In the meantime the Convocation of York declined the invitation to join in the movement, so that the Revision was carried on under the authority of the Southern Convocation and, when the work of the Revisers on the Testaments was completed in 1881 and 1885, it was formally presented to that body.

THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE.—American participation may be dated from June 7, 1870, when the Convocation of Canterbury gave to the British Committee power to "invite the coöperation of some American divines." This was in accordance with the resolution passed a month before that "the Committee be at liberty to invite the coöperation of any eminent for scholarship to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

The actual constitution of the American Committee was entered upon when Dr. Angus of the Baptist College of Bristol and one of the British Revisers, on his visit in the United States in 1870 to attend the Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, originally proposed for that year, clothed with power by the Chairman of the British New Testament Company, approached Dr. Philip Schaff of the Union Theological Seminary and other American scholars on the subject of a coöperative committee. At this point, it may be said that in England the two companies, one for the Old and one for the New Testament, acted in all matters separately and were not joined for purposes of common action in one committee as were the two American Companies.

A draft of a constitution, submitted by Dr. Schaff upon request, proposed among other things that the American Committee be composed "of a select number of biblical scholars and divines from the leading Protestant denominations," and "coöperate with the British Committee on terms of fraternal equality" and that, "if possible, a joint meeting of the two committees be held in London or New York before final action." The Constitution adopted by the American Committee on its formal organization, December 7, 1871, substituted for the first of these clauses the expression "biblical scholars and divines" and omitted from the second the words "on terms of fraternal equality." These changes had been commended by Dean Stanley, through whom, at this juncture, the preliminary correspondence was carried on. The dean called for the omission from Dr.

Schaff's draft of the expression "the leading Protestant denominations," and declared under all circumstances the word "'Protestant' as unnecessary as well as inconsistent with the action of the British Committee which had invited an eminent Roman Catholic, Dr. Newman, to sit with it.'" The expression "terms of fraternal equality" the dean also objected to, on the ground that "though doubtless most reasonable as regards the spirit in which it is made, it might mislead unless more carefully explained." Still another objection offered by the dean but not concurred in was to an ultimate joint conference of the two Committees, as it "was unlikely that the suggestion practically can be carried into effect and might therefore mislead, although the spirit of the suggestion is excellent." The reference, however, to a joint meeting was incorporated in the constitution of the American Committee, with the change that it should be held "if possible, in London."

A list of names for the American Committee, which upon request Dr. Schaff sent to England, was returned by Dean Stanley, also with several changes. The name of Dr. Washburn was omitted. Dr. William G. T. Shedd was substituted for Dr. Charles A. Hodge, the name of Dr. Ezra Abbot was added. Returning this revised list, the dean bade Dr. Schaff proceed in arranging with the gentlemen whose names it contained, and, "also (if you see fit), with Bishop Potter, representing the Protestant Episcopal Church." At the same time, he went on to say that to the Bishop of Winchester, "my superior in rank," was committed the responsibility of communicating with Bishop Potter as the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Bishop of Winchester's communication, dated August 7, 1871, was in due time presented to the Convention of the Episcopal Church by Bishop Potter and laid on the table; with the further action that the "House, having had no part in originating or organizing the work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it."

A communication addressed by Dr. Schaff to Bishop Potter had no favorable result. Other bishops, whom, after personal conference with the British Revisers in London in the Summer of 1871, Dr. Schaff invited to sit on the American Committee, declined. Among these, Bishop McIlvaine gave his "brain health" as the reason for declining, at the same time expressing his full sympathy with the movement. The American Committee at its formal organization, December 7, 1871, included in its membership two Episcopalians, Prof. Hare and Dr. Washburn. The British Committee, still pressing for the representation of the American episcopate on the Committee, withheld consignments of its work for six months longer.

The importance laid in England upon an adequate representation of the American episcopate, which is easily understood, was voiced in a letter written by Bishop Ellicott "in a private capacity" to Dr. Schaff and dated April 22, 1872. The writer said "it would be imprudent for us to take any final step till your Committee is so constituted as to represent (with other Communities) the Episcopal Church distinctly and acceptably. The presence of two Bishops or so would at once give the home-public of Church-people the needed confidence." Nor was this feeling confined to the Anglican Communion. Dr. Lee, Bishop of Delaware, having joined the New Testament Company, Dr. Angus, in a private letter to Dr. Schaff expressing his gratification at Dr. Lee's accession, went on to say "the New Testament Company is now complete, still there would be some advantage if both Companies could be reported to us as episcopally complete." Later, in the Summer of 1872, after meeting with the British Companies in London, and in view of Bishop Lee's acceptance, Dean Stanley said to Dr. Schaff "one bishop is quite enough."

At the formal organization of the American Committee, December 7, 1871, which was made in Dr. Schaff's study, No. 42 Bible House, New York, nine members were pres-

ent, namely, Drs. Philip Schaff, Thomas J. Conant, William Henry Green, George Emlen Hare, Charles F. Krauth, and George E. Day of the Old Testament Company and Ezra Abbot, Henry B. Smith, and Edward A. Washburn of the New Testament Company. The constitution which has already been spoken of stipulated that "the American Committee shall coöperate on the basis of the principles and rules adopted by the British Committee" and, having received from the British Committee its revision, would "transmit their criticisms and suggestions" to it before its second revision.

As an indication of the effort made to bring the cause of revision to the attention of the American public, it may be noted that in the evening, after the organization of the Committee, a popular meeting was held in the Calvary Episcopal Church, New York, at which, after prayer offered by Prof. Hare, the cause was presented in addresses by Dean Howson of Chester, Dr. Washburn, and Dr. Schaff. The last speaker, among other things, said that "our very respect for the English version of the Scriptures demands that we should free it from defects and our respect for the Christian Church demands that we should give it the benefit of all that accumulation of Scriptural learning which has come to pass since the Authorized Version was prepared." From this time forward, the work of revision was kept before the American public through the press and by addresses delivered in parlors, churches, and church conventions, from Boston to San Francisco. Among the notable gatherings were meetings held in the homes of William E. Dodge, Elliott F. Shepard, and Morris K. Jesup, in New York City, where distinguished bodies of laymen were brought into contact with the Revisers and heard from them directly their estimate of the significance of the Revision Work.

At the first meeting at which the actual work of revision was taken up, October 4, 1872, the organization was com-

pleted by the election of Dr. Schaff as President of the Committee and Prof. Day, of New Haven as Secretary. The two Companies into which the Committee was divided chose ex-President Woolsey and Dr. Green as their Chairmen. The meetings were held in 42 and 44 Bible House, the two rooms being connected by a door, no charge being made for their use by the American Bible Society.

First and last, the Committee comprised thirty-two members, fifteen for the Old Testament and seventeen for the revision of the New. Of these, Dr. Charles A. Hodge, of Princeton, attended none of the meetings, although he was consulted by letter. Prof. VanDyck, of Beirut, was a corresponding member. Prof. Henry B. Smith, of Union Theological Seminary, after attending a single meeting, resigned on account of failing health. Prof. Hadley, of New Haven, who entered into the movement with great spirit, died after attending a single meeting. Drs. Crooks and Warren, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, declined invitations of membership. According to denominational affiliations and omitting the above persons the active members were divided as follows: four Baptists, Thomas J. Conant, 1802-91, Horatio B. Hackett, 1808-75, Asahel C. Kendrick, 1809-95, and Howard Osgood, 1831-1911, the three last of Rochester University and Seminary; six Congregationalists, George E. Day, 1815-1905, Theodore D. Woolsey, 1801-89, Timothy Dwight, 1823-1917, all of Yale University; Calvin E. Stowe, 1802-86, Charles M. Mead, 1836-1911, J. Henry Thayer, 1828-1901, all once or at the time professors at Andover; three Dutch Reformed, Talbot W. Chambers, 1819-96, of New York, John De Witt, 1821-1906, of New Brunswick Seminary, and Tayler Lewis, 1802-77, of Union College; five Episcopalians, Bishop Alfred Lee, of Delaware, 1807-87, George E. Hare, 1808-92, of the Divinity School, Philadelphia, Joseph Packard, 1812-1902, of the Alexandria Divinity School, Charles Short, 1821-86, Columbia University, Edward A. Wash-

burn, 1819-81, rector, New York City; one Friend, Thomas Chase, 1827-92, of Haverford College; one Lutheran, Charles P. Krauth, 1823-83, of the University of Pennsylvania; two Methodists, Jonathan K. Burr, 1825-82, pastor, and James Strong, 1822-94, of Drew Seminary; five Presbyterians, Charles A. Aiken, 1827-92, and William H. Green, 1825-96, both of Princeton Seminary, Howard Crosby, 1826-91, pastor in New York, Matthew B. Riddle, 1837-1916, professor at Hartford and the Western Seminaries, Philip Schaff, 1819-93, of Union Theological Seminary; one Unitarian, Ezra Abbot, 1819-84, of Harvard University. As regards the principle upon which the selection of members was made Dr. Schaff said "Reference was had first of all to ability, experience and reputation in biblical learning and criticism, next to denominational connection, so as to have a fair representation of the leading churches and theological institutions and last, to local convenience, in order to secure regular attendance. Several distinguished divines in the far West and the South whose coöperation would have been very desirable had, on the last ground of necessity, to be omitted." All the members, with the exception of two or three, were or had been professors of Greek or Hebrew in theological or academic institutions.

The two American Companies held their meetings the last Friday in the month beginning at 9 A.M., and continuing till noon the following day, except during the Summer months when meetings, lasting a week, were held in New York, Princeton, Andover, New Haven, New Brunswick, or at Lake Mohonk. The members of each Company sat around a long table. At the head of the table occupied by the New Testament Revisers sat Dr. Woolsey and at its foot Dr. Crosby. On Dr. Woolsey's right sat Drs. Lee, Thayer, Abbot, Kendrick, and Dwight, and at his left, Drs. Short, Riddle, Hackett, Chase, Burr, and Washburn. Dr. Schaff sat at his study desk just behind Dr. Short except when he drew forward to the table to take part in some

important discussion. On occasions when Dr. Woolsey was temporarily absent from the room, Dr. Crosby presided, often startling the more cautious members such as Dr. Abbot by the speed with which he conducted the business. Dr. Schaff, in writing of one afternoon's work, reported that "Dr. Crosby drove us very hard to-day."

The Old Testament Company began its work by reviewing the British Revision of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus: the New Testament Company by reviewing the British copy of the three Synoptic Gospels. These and succeeding installments of the first British Revision were printed in large print, bound in paper covers, and marked "private and confidential." One copy was sent to each of the American Revisers and in the case of the New Testament portion contained the name of the particular person for whom it was intended written by Bishop Ellicott. The copy of the three Gospels, intended for Dr. Schaff, has written on it the words, "First and Provisional Revision. Private and Confidential. This copy is for the use of Prof. Philip Schaff alone, and is not to be published or communicated to any one beyond the body of American Revisers. Signed, C. J. Gloucester and Bristol, Chairmen."

The changes made by the American Companies on this first British Revision were printed and sent to England. After action had been taken on them the books were printed again and the consignments sent to the United States. The changes made by the American Revisers were again printed and sent to England where consideration was given to them. The American changes on the first British Revision of Luke filled 16 pages and amounted to about 500 changes in all; the changes on Acts filled 22 pages and amounted to about 650 changes in all. According to Bishop Ellicott in the Preface of the Revised New Testament of 1881, there were in all seven goings-over of the English text before the final New Testament Revision was completed.

The following was the mode of procedure by the Ameri-

can New Testament Company. Dr. Woolsey read a verse in the British Revised form and was followed by Bishop Lee who read the corresponding verse in the Authorized Version. Discussion followed. A majority vote carried a change on the first revision. At the second revision, that is, the review of the second British Revision, a two thirds vote was required. The portion to be gone over at a given meeting was fixed the month before. Some of the members brought elaborate notes with them. No printed Greek text was used as final. As the work of Revision proceeded in Westminster and New York, the divergent Greek readings were considered each by itself. Dr. Kendrick had before him at the meetings of the Committee Tregelles' text, one of the members Alford's Greek Testament, Dr. Schaff the provisional text of the Gospels prepared by Westcott and Hort and marked "Confidential." Dr. Schaff's copy, lying before me, is full of marginal notes and interlineations.¹ The Greek readings adopted by the Revisers, which came to be known as the "Revisers' Text," appeared in two editions of the Greek Testament in 1881, the one issued by Scrivener: "The New Testament in the Original Greek" according to the text followed in the A. V. together with the variations adopted in the Rev. Ver., Cambridge; the other by E. Palmer, Archdeacon of Oxford, "The Greek Text with the Readings Adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version," Oxford.

The discussions, which were often protracted, concerned first of all the Greek text, then passed on to questions of the translation of the original and to the consistent or uniform rendering of the Greek word by the same English word, and lastly took up the English style, a matter treated as of large

¹ Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament was published in 1881. The work on it was begun in 1853. Dr. Philip Schaff, who issued the American edition, with an Introduction, says of it, "Few works have ever been prepared with so much labor, care, and devotion." For Dr. Schaff's estimate of Dr. Hort's merits as a textual scholar of the Greek New Testament, see Introduction, p. viii.

importance. Denominational preferences and theological bias played no part in the discussions. An example, used by Dr. Riddle in proof of this, was the decision by a vote of 7 to 3 substituting in the text "baptize with water," Matt. 3: 11, and in similar passages for "baptize in water." It may be accepted as certain that the American Revisers had fully as much concern as had later critics of their work for the venerable style and rhythm of the King James' Version. Take the passage, Phil. 3: 21, which, in its American Revised form, reads "who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory." In making the change from the familiar form "who shall change our vile body," etc., the Revisers were governed by the plain meaning of the original. The care with which the work was done is proved by the labor devoted to certain Greek texts such as John 1: 18 and Acts XX: 28 on which Dr. Abbot prepared elaborate papers which were printed, considered by the American Revisers and then sent to England.² In England the same mode of procedure was followed, Dr. Hort's papers being especially noteworthy.

To its task the New Testament Company brought ample qualifications. Its members were masters of the Greek language and lexicography. Dr. Abbot was the leading New Testament textual critic the United States had up to that time produced, and, partly through his connection with the Revision, he came to be recognized in Europe as an expert in his line. He subjected the Tischendorf text to painstaking study. Prof. Thayer was by his studies unexcelled in matters of Greek grammar. Little less can be said of Prof. Riddle, the youngest member of the Committee. Drs. Kendrick, Chase, Short, and Crosby were proficient in classical Greek. Dr. Dwight was an all-around student of the New

² These papers are included in Abbot, *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays*, Boston, 1888. In his article, "Anglo-American Bible Revision," p. 92, Dr. Abbot expressed the important opinion that the doctrine of the Trinity one way or the other is not affected by the differences in the Greek text.

Testament. Bishop Lee brought to his work a singularly clear biblical instinct and he and Dr. Washburn were always heard when a matter of English style was involved. Dr. Chase, the Quaker and the slowest to express a judgment, was not infrequently called upon by the chairman for his opinion on the question at issue. By this impartial judgment and in his patience in allowing wide liberty of discussion, Dr. Woolsey commanded great respect. He spoke seldom, but when he spoke, his suggestions were met with marked attention. Pertinent books on the shelves, belonging to Dr. Schaff's library, and other books collected especially for the Revisers' work were continually consulted.

Here is an episode in the discussion over Hebrews 11:1, translated in the American Revision "Faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen." Dr. Washburn half facetiously remarked, "If we make this alteration, people will think we have changed realities into persuasions and evidence into subjective convictions, and this throws us into the hands of Mr. Mill." "That may all be very good, Dr., replied Dr. Kendrick, "but the Greek does refer to subjective states." Discussing Heb. 11:14, Bishop Lee preferred "fatherland" to "country," saying that "It is in accordance with biblical style." A member, dissenting on the ground that the word was not in common use, wanted "native country," quoting the national hymn. Over the clause in the second verse, "obtained a good report," which, in the American Version, runs, "the elders had witness borne to them," there was a protracted discussion. The translation, "had testimony borne unto them" was first passed and then a return made to the wording of the Authorized Version. Dr. Washburn remarked the good report which the elders obtained was "in the works as the results of faith." Dr. Kendrick referred the allusion "to men and God also"; Dr. Abbot "to God and the Old Testament." "Testimony," he said, "was borne by God in his Word unto them." When the question was up on adopting

the expression "vain talking" for "idle talk," I Tim. 1:6, Dr. Woolsey remarked, "It was the worst thing that could be got." When several substitutes were proposed for "not greedy of filthy lucre," I Tim. 3:8, Dr. Woolsey remarked, "It is a good expression and ought to be kept. It may weigh on the English and American conscience." "But it means the money itself," said Dr. Kendrick. "I never understood it so," was the reply.

The discussions, serious as they usually were, did not lack at time the relaxing element. The Authorized Version places a comma between "assembly" and "church" in Hebrews 12:23, reading "to the general assembly, and church of the first born." When the question came to striking out the comma, Dr. Riddle had much amusement over the surmised offense that would thereby be given to good Presbyterians who would be sure to reject the Revision rather than give up their General Assembly. Dr. Riddle, at this time already very deaf, was obliged to put his hand to his ear, turning from side to side, to catch what was going on and those who remember him will recall that when a pun was passed or a witticism, his whole facial expression became a bit of humor. In the revision of I Tim. 6:16, containing the clause "to whom be honor and power," Dr. Washburn suggested the word "might" as a substitute for "power." To this, Dr. Kendrick replied, "That is very little in comparison with the full word 'power.'" "Yes," replied Dr. Crosby, "M-i-t-e is." Discussing the clause "burnt-offerings and sacrifices," Heb. 10:6, Dr. Riddle said, "Shall we Romanize 'sacrifices?,' to which Dr. Kendrick replied, "No, they are already pretty well Romanized." At the meeting of February 27, 1877, the day on which the Oregon (Cronin) case, bearing on the election of Mr. Hayes or Mr. Tilden to the presidency, was to be decided, discussion being on the English translation of "oregontai," Heb. 11:16, "now they *desire* a better country," Dr. Crosby remarked, "The Oregon-tie is about to be settled for us,

Gentlemen, once and for all in Washington. I move we pass on to the next."

The expenses of carrying on the American Committee's work were met by donations received from all parts of the country amounting to \$47,561. The Revisers received their travelling and hotel expenses but no financial compensation for their work. The expense of the British undertaking, amounting to \$100,000, was met by the University Presses which controlled the copyright of the new work.

THE AMERICAN VARIANT REVISION.—The Standard American Bible, as it came to be called, was issued in 1901. The question arises why it happened that an American Revision was published distinct from the Revision of 1881-85. The reason is found in disagreements between the two committees which involved changes looked upon by the American Revisers as "of special importance." The American Revisers felt, on the one hand, under the obligation of preserving if possible a single English Bible and, on the other hand, of presenting a translation which in their judgment would best carry the meaning of the original to the American reader. It was found to be out of accord with the legal arrangements in England to hold a joint meeting of the two committees before the final Revision as proposed in the American constitution of December 7, 1871, but, even if such a meeting had been held, the reasons it may safely be said, would still have been regarded as sufficient to demand an American "recension." The way in which the publication of the two Revisions was brought about was this:

As early as the Spring of 1873, the American Committee sought from the British Companies a definition of its "precise standing" and the extent to which recognition was to be given to its work. The word coöperation had been used in the official correspondence from the beginning and the documents indicate that the plan, though not closely defined, was that the work should be reciprocal. In a letter dated April, 1874, Bishop Ellicott wrote "we wish to be on the

most cordial and reciprocative terms with you." The definition of the word *coöperation* involves a correspondence lasting nearly four years with the British Revision Companies on the one hand and with the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge. At first, as appears from a letter written by Dr. Angus, it was proposed that the expenses of the British undertaking should be met by "an appeal to the English public." Later the University Presses undertook to meet all such expenses, the copyright belonging to them. For this reason the British Companies felt themselves to be unable to give precise limitations to the American *coöperation*, being bound by their contract with the Presses.

On May 31, 1873, the American Committee instructed its president, who was about to visit Europe, "to intimate that it expected to have a positive and well-defined weight in the final determination of the Revised Scriptures." The two official replies, July 16, 17, were that the British Companies "would give the most careful consideration to any suggestions that may be made by the American Committee" and "attach great weight and importance to all its suggestions." Both British Companies, however, made the reservation that the "fundamental rules of their constitution and the terms of agreement into which they had entered with the University Presses forbade their admission to the right of voting to any but their own members." The response of the American Revisers was that these resolutions seemed to mean that they were to be precluded from a vote on the final text of the Revision, and they took the ground that they had entered upon their work on the supposition that they were joint Revisers with joint responsibility, and also that the agreement between the British Companies and the University Presses, having been made subsequent to the formation of the American Committee, did not modify this understanding. In addition it was urged that the American people, which constituted one half of the English-speaking race, would hold the American Committee responsible for the Revision, whatever the Revision might be.

Little or no progress had been made when the President of the American Committee appeared officially before the British New Testament Company in Jerusalem Chamber, June 15, and the Old Testament Company, July 8, 1875. On these occasions he used to say he fought again the battle of American rights and independence. Before his arrival in England and in view of a renewed demand for a definition of the "precise status" of the American Committee, which had begun its labors "under the impression that we were fellow revisers and not merely advisers," the British Companies had taken action reaffirming their resolutions of two years previous, July 16, 17, 1873. At the same time they expressed the hope of the continued coöperative relations of the two bodies. This action seemed to preclude further negotiations. Dr. Schaff wrote in his journal, June 4, 1875, "My mission about Revision is apparently cut off by the resolution of the British Companies adhering to their former action." But not dismayed, he set himself in communication with the chairmen of the two Companies, Dr. Ellicott and Dr. Brown, Bishop of Winchester, Dean Stanley, and others so that on June 14th he could note "I have had full and satisfactory exchange of views on the relation of our Revision Committee to the British Companies. I shall propose as an ultimatum a committee of conference and an independent coöperation with the separate publication of an English and American Revision differing only in minor points of national taste, etc." After breakfasting with Mr. Gladstone he noted again in his Journal, "I was delighted with his simplicity and frankness. His broad common sense suggested the same solution of the Revision question which I had arrived at, namely independent coöperation." The progress of the negotiations may be best indicated in Dr. Schaff's notes, which ran as follows: "June 15th. Have the greatest contest of my life. Summoned to the Jerusalem Chamber at 2:45, I fought with the New Testament Company for three hours for the American rights and pro-

posed as an ultimatum independent coöperation to the end, with two Revisions. I must fight the same battle with the Old Testament Company.—July 7th, spent the evening in preparing for the second great contest—July 8th, I met the Old Testament Company in the Chapter Library, Westminster, at 11 A.M., Bishop Brown in the chair. Made an address in behalf of the American Revision Committee which was very kindly responded to by the chairman, and then answered many questions.—July 15th, To-day the New Testament Company adopted the Old Testament Company's resolution for a settlement of the American question by adopting some members of our Committee into theirs, subject to the approval of the University Presses.—July 16th, The New Testament Revision Company adjourned to-day. I was in the Jerusalem Chamber, Dr. Scrivener congratulated me for getting so much out of the English Companies. He says it is a marvel. Canon Troutbeck gave me the action which is conditioned, but it gives me more than I asked for and secures mutual protection." In his addresses before the Companies, Dr. Schaff demanded for the American Committee the "standing of fellow-authors and fellow-revisers with corresponding claims." The plan of coöptation, as it was called by Bishop Ellicott, whereby four members of each committee were to be voted in as members of the other ultimately failed owing to the opposition of the University Presses.

A final crisis was precipitated by the action of the University Presses taken June 14, 1876, forbidding further transmission of Revision material to the United States. The circumstances which led up to this "startling intelligence" were as follows: As early as 1873 the American Committee had communicated with the University Presses with reference to the purchase of duplicate plates of the forthcoming Revised Bible. The Presses replied, expressing their readiness to dispose of such plates at the market prices, and proposed a further payment of £5000. This

proposed settlement was finally put in the form of a demand, January, 1876. The American Committee was to purchase stereotype and electro plates of all the editions which the Presses might issue and "pay £5000 sterling for the copyright and other privileges to be granted." The copyright laws of this country at that time gave little or no protection to books published abroad. The American Revisers were ready to pay for duplicate plates of the British editions and to grant the moral weight of their approval to the circulation of the English editions in the United States: but they were not willing to pay the sum stipulated or any sum which seemed to be of the nature of compensation to the University Presses for meeting the expense of the Revision so far as England was concerned. The expense of the undertaking in America was being met by voluntary contributions. As for protecting legally the English copyright in the United States, that it was not in its power to do. Continuing in its correspondence with the British Companies to insist that the agreement was "a moral one entirely" and that the "main question of its joint responsibility be treated independently of all commercial arrangements," the American Committee received final replies from the British Revisers dated February 23, and March 15, 1876, to the effect that "however desirable it might be to separate financial considerations from the question of joint authorship and copyright, such a separation was in this case not possible inasmuch as the interest of the University Presses was, to a large extent, though not exclusively, of a financial character," and that the financial arrangements would have to be disposed of by the American Committee and the University Presses as the two parties.

A private letter, written by Professor Hort to Dr. Schaff, shows the state of feeling among the British Revisers. "It is a great disappointment," wrote Dr. Hort, "to find that fresh difficulties have arisen in the negotiation about the Revised Version when it seemed to be promising well. . . . I

must confess my inability to find fault with the requirements put forward by the Presses. The terms themselves appear to be reasonable, to say the least. . . . You may rest assured that there is among us, not in the Companies only but also, if I may speak for my own University [Cambridge], in the authorities of the Presses, a strong desire to maintain the substantial unity in the Revised Bible of both countries and also to respect and uphold the just self-respect of our brethren across the water in every practicable matter."

A complete rupture of the relations of the two Committees and perhaps a discontinuance of the work of the Revision by the American Committee would have been inevitable but for a reopening of the correspondence by Dr. Cartmell of Cambridge for the University Presses. The April and May meetings of the American Committee, 1876, were taken up almost entirely with the consideration of the course it should pursue. One party favored an independent American Revision, Dr. Dwight being perhaps the strongest advocate of this policy. The members from the Episcopal Church and Dr. Green were as decidedly in favor of disbanding the Committee rather than undertake a separate Revision. A third party to which Dr. Crosby, Dr. Chambers, Dr. Day, and Dr. Schaff belonged were in favor of delaying final action in the hope of coming to an understanding agreeable to both parties. As it turned out, a letter received from Dr. Cartmell made possible a renewal of coöperative relations. This most courteous and admirable document dated July 10, 1876, withdrew "in every particular the offer the Presses had made to the American Committee and which the American Committee had been unable to accept and also the entire question of copyright, in view of the practical uncertainty of establishing in America a copyright in the Revised Version." Dr. Cartmell then went on to say that the coöperation of the two Committees need not be discontinued and promised "favorable consideration for any arrangements to continue it that the American Commit-

tee might have to suggest." Before this, it might be stated, an opinion on American copyright for the Revision prepared by Judge Fancher had been transmitted to England. This may have influenced the University Presses to take the action communicated by Dr. Cartmell.

The discussion in the American Committee over this communication occupied the full day of September 30, 1876, and was based upon a resolution prepared by a subcommittee consisting of Drs. Woolsey, Green, Day, and Schaff and upon which the subcommittee had spent the whole previous afternoon and evening. The action proposed that the interchange of Revision work be resumed and the two Committees proceed with the aim of preparing one and the same Revision "with the privilege of issuing, should it be deemed advisable, two recensions of the same Revision with such differences as they may not be able to adjust to their mutual satisfaction."

This action was accepted in England with the added provisions that the English Version should contain in an Appendix the differences which the American Revisers deemed to be "of special importance" and that, after a period of fourteen years succeeding the publication in England, the American Committee should be free to publish an edition of its own. In addition, the English Companies agreed to take under review the American changes of their second revision, a concession going beyond the letter of their constitution.

The agreement was alike honorable to both parties. The British Committee was fully competent to carry on the revision without outside aid. The University Presses were fair in demanding that their copyright should be, if possible, respected in the United States. On the other hand, the American Committee, upon the basis of the original invitation, and with an eye to its own large constituency, declined any other standing than that of fellow Revisers with joint responsibilities. That the agreement was entered into heartily in England is vouched for by a telegram sent by Dr.

Schaff from London, January 1, 1877, "I am exceedingly thankful for the result and so is every British Reviser I have seen." In consequence of this action, the British Versions of 1881 and 1885 contained American Appendixes and the American Standard Bible was issued in New York, 1901.

During a part of the time when these negotiations were going on and no Revision material was being received from England, the American New Testament Committee worked on an independent revision of Hebrews, Timothy, and Titus, the text being furnished in interleaved form by the American Bible Society. To follow Dr. Schaff's journal, "The New Testament Company met November 26, 1876, and began the independent revision of Hebrews. Members present, Drs. Woolsey, Lee, Thayer, Abbot, Kendrick, Dwight, Crosby, Washburn, Burr, Chase, Riddle, Schaff, and D. S. Schaff. All present except Dr. Short who appeared in the afternoon." This independent work was finished at the May meeting of 1877. By that time a new installment of the English Revision extending from 1st Corinthians through Hebrews had been received.

The state of feeling among the American Revisers concerning the extent of the Appendix to be published in 1881 finds expression in one of Dr. Schaff's entries which is as follows: "New Haven, July 7, 1880. Dr. Woolsey read the section in the Agreement bearing on the American Appendix. The question is what are 'changes of special importance'? Dr. Crosby: Favors the smallest Appendix, confined to classes of changes, that the reader may get an impression of our agreement, rather than disagreement.—Bishop Lee: Same opinion. At the same time, he wishes other changes might be preserved.—Professor Chase: Undecided.—Dr. Dwight: Our suggestions are analogous to the marginal reading. Our Appendix is an enlargement of the margin. The Revision will be severely criticized for not having this or that improvement, for unfaithfulness to our opportunity. This objection will be met in part by a large

Appendix.—Dr. Schaff: Suggests a small Appendix for the Authorized edition of the Revision, and a separate publication of all our changes which shall perpetuate the results of our ten years' labors for the use of scholars.—Dr. Abbot: We are bound in honor to take the language 'of special importance' in its natural sense, but we can not say without special examination what is of special importance.—Dr. Riddle: Of the same opinion. Go on with a view to reducing the number of suggestions.—Dr. Thayer: Sides with Dr. Dwight for a large Appendix on the ground of intrinsic merits rather than practical effect.—Dr. Kendrick: Gives a liberal construction to our agreement, yet narrows it so as to make the Appendix as small as is consistent with fidelity to the Word of God and the readers of the Bible. An Appendix is in itself an evil: the larger the Appendix, the greater the evil.—Dr. Woolsey: Favors with Drs. Dwight and Thayer a large Appendix. If the Appendix be so small as Dr. Crosby suggests, I shall feel that I have spent my time in vain. Dr. Schaff suggests a special publication. That may be done. Yet the Appendix ought to be pretty full."

The last meeting of the American New Testament Revisers held to complete their work occurred October 22, 1880. Dr. Schaff referred to it in this way, "New Testament finished after eight years of labor, beginning October, 1872. An important chapter in our lives. We parted almost in tears with mingled feelings of gladness at the completion of the work and sadness at the breaking up of our monthly meetings so full of instruction and interest and ruled by perfect harmony." Of the last session of the Old Testament Revisers, held December 15, 1884, he wrote, "On this day the Old Testament Company of Revisers finished their work of fourteen years. Next week I shall send the American Appendix [of the Old Testament] to England. *Te Deum laudamus*. We lunched together yesterday and to-day at Sieghöftners and then parted thankfully."

THE PUBLICATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, 1881.—The arrival of the Revised Version of the New Testament in the United States, May 20, 1881, was a veritable sensation. On the streets of New York the newsboys were heard crying, "Here's yer New Testament, jest out!" Within a month not less than ten different American editions were either published or advertised. Among these was the cheap edition in Harpers' Franklin Square Library, May 27, 1881, pp. 121, substituting the American Appendix in the text and giving the British version at the foot of the page. By the end of 1881, at least thirty American reprints were on the market and it was estimated that within a year 3,000,000 copies had been sold in England and the United States. Between May 20 and December 31, 1881, the Oxford Clarendon Press, through its New York agency, sold 365,000 copies, and through its Philadelphia agents, 110,000 copies. One American firm during the Summer of 1881 sold 100,000 copies and another 65,000 copies of their own editions. Perhaps the most notable feature of this extensive circulation was the enterprise shown by the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Chicago Times*, both of which printed the entire New Testament in their columns. The *Chicago Tribune* employed 92 compositors and five proof-readers and the whole work was set up in 12 hours. In the case of the *Chicago Times*, the text of the four Gospels, the Acts and the Epistle to the Romans was telegraphed from New York, the remainder of the work being set up from a copy which by that time, May 21, had reached Chicago. The telegraphed message contained 118,000 words, by far the longest despatch up to that time transmitted by wire. The *Times*, not without just pride, said "Such a publication as this is entirely without precedent." This remarkable reception of the Revised New Testament may be contrasted with the reception given to Tyndale's New Testament, the first printed English New Testament, 1525, all the copies of which that could be laid hands on being burnt in St. Paul's Church yard by Tonstall, Bishop of London.

THE AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION.—After the appearance of the Revised Old Testament, 1881, the responsibility of making preparations for the separate American Revision was immediately met by a resolution to issue such an edition after the fourteen-year period, set by agreement with the University Presses, was at an end. The organization of the American Committee was perpetuated by annual meetings. The president of the Committee who was deeply interested in the American edition died 1893. The feeling of the survivors was voiced by Professor DeWitt, who wrote in 1895 that, in spite of the deaths which had occurred, "the work of the American Revision must surely be carried out." In 1897, when their number was reduced to nine, arrangements were made with the publishing house of Thomas Nelson and Sons to publish the volume and bear the expenses of its preparation. As heretofore, so now the Revisers received no financial compensation for their time and work. When the firm proposed to remunerate them, Dr. Thayer exclaimed, "If I took money for this work, I would be ashamed to meet President Woolsey in heaven." The three surviving members of the New Testament were Drs. Thayer, Dwight, and Riddle. Referring to the labor of preparing the American edition, Dr. Riddle, in an address delivered in the Western Theological Seminary, 1914, said that it was "probably the most exacting in the entire history of the Revision." Three copies of the proofs were sent to each and three proofs were read by as many professional proof-readers of the Nelson firm. These copies were then exchanged and re-read so that the printers' errors might be reduced to the smallest number possible. The work of editing the Old Testament was carried on by Professors Day, DeWitt, Osgood, and Mead, the burden falling chiefly upon Dr. Mead. The last meeting of the three New Testament Revisers was held October 19, 1900. Professor Thayer lived to write the Preface of the American New Testament Revision, dying three months after its appear-

ance in the printed volume. Dr. Riddle and Dr. Dwight, the two last survivors of the American Committee, died respectively in 1916 and 1917.

The American Revision was put on sale August 26, 1901. The estimate which the American Revisers put upon the Revision movement was expressed after the appearance of the English Revised Bible in 1881, by Dr. Schaff, in this way: "The Revision of the English Scriptures is an epoch in the history of the Bible." In the address just referred to, Dr. Riddle pronounced the Revision "the greatest work of the 19th century," having in mind no doubt ecclesiastical occurrences within the bounds of English-speaking Christendom. Bishop Lee declared the Revised Bible to be "its own best defense."

As for the American Recension, the judgment of its value is thus set forth in the Preface to the American volume: "The present volume, it is believed, will on the one hand bring a plain reader more closely into contact with the exact thought of the sacred writers than any version now current in Christendom and, on the other hand, prove itself especially serviceable to students of the Word. In this belief the editors bid it anew God-speed and, in the realization of this desired result, they will find their all sufficient reward."

THE AMERICAN CHANGES.—The American changes which are explained in the two Prefaces to the American edition were based on the Appendixes to the Version 1881-1885, the official notes kept by the secretaries, and the record of the votes there given. The Appendixes, necessarily, as it happened, were prepared with some haste, and did not contain a full list of the divergent wishes of the American Committee. It may be objected that the number of American Revisers being reduced, the text given by the survivors can not be relied on as in every case an accurate index of the mind of the full American Committee. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the surviving members were among the most active of the original Revisers and it

is not to be thought of that they substituted willingly any of their own preferences for the understood opinions of the Committee as a whole.

So far as the improvements over the Revisions of 1881-85 go, it may be said in general that the American Revision adds a carefully selected list of marginal references, furnishes at the top of the pages summaries of their contents, is provided with a simplified punctuation, and has clearly indicated by numerals the verse divisions, thus meeting wide-spread objections to the English Revision. As a matter of English, the relative pronoun, when it applies to persons, is invariably altered in the American Revision to "who" or "that." As examples of adaptation to American usage "penny" is changed to "shilling" and "corn" to "grain" in such passages as "going through the corn fields they did pluck ears, rubbing them in their hands," Luke 6: 11 the English meaning by "corn," oats, or other small grain. As examples of fidelity to original manuscripts the epithet "Saint" is left out from the headings of the Gospels and Epistles and the "Revelation of St. John the Divine" became the "Revelation of John." As examples of giving the distinctive meaning of the original, "Jehovah" was substituted for "Lord" in the Old Testament to distinguish it from the other Hebrew word for God, "Elohim," and the word Sheol (place of the dead) is uniformly retained in the translation, whereas the Revision of 1881-85 translates it "grave" or "pit" in 35 cases out of 64. In the New Testament "Teacher" is substituted for "Master" and "demon" for "devil" where the Greek is "*daimon*." As an example of exact rendering, Paul is made to have said in his address on Mars hill, Acts XVII: 22 "Ye are very religious" instead of "Ye are somewhat superstitious," the rendering of the Version of 1881.

A comparison of the British and American Revisions will, on the one hand, show that in matters of biblical scholarship there was almost perfect accord. On the other hand, it is a

matter of congratulation that the American Revisers asserted their independent rights and from a sense of obligation as scholars and to the American Churches insisted first upon the issue of the Appendixes of 1881-85 and then issued the American Edition of 1901. The American Edition improved the Revision as a translation for the American reader. To the question to what extent the vote of the British Revisers was affected by the suggestions of the American Committee, an answer is given in the list of American changes adopted in the Revised Bible of 1881, prepared by Bishop Lee and printed in Schaff's *Companion to the Greek New Testament*. That list fills nearly thirty pages and shows that nearly or quite one thousand such changes were adopted, three hundred of them belonging to the Gospels. If we go further and seek for the estimate put on the American Appendix by individual British Revisers, Dr. Riddle assures us that Bishop Ellicott in his commentary on 1st Corinthians accepted one half of the changes there preferred.

The following comparison will show the agreement of the British and American New Testament Companies working independently. The texts are the independent revision of the American Revisers, taken from Dr. Schaff's copy made as the changes were being made, and the First Revision of the British Revisers. These independent texts were made, as will be recalled, during the period when there was no interchange of Revision work and before the American Revisers received the First Revision from England of Hebrews, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus. The passage is Heb. 1:1-4.

American Revision, 1876

God, having of old spoken in many portions and in many ways unto the fathers in the prophets, At the end of these days spoke unto us in *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom he also made the worlds;

British Revision, 1876

God, having of old time by divers portions and divers manners spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the

Who being the effulgence of his glory and the exact image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made a cleansing of sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high; Having become so much superior to the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name than theirs.

worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they.

This article may be closed with two observations.

1. The Revised English Bible represents the most notable exhibition of Church union within the English-speaking world during the last three centuries. It was fitting that the movement of Revision should begin in the Church of England, from which had proceeded the Authorized Version. It was equally fitting that the non-Conformist communions of Great Britain should be invited to join in a work which concerned all English-speaking Christians alike. From the very outset the work was put on a broad Christian and not on a sectarian basis by the resolutions of the Convocation of Canterbury, 1870. From this attitude there was no departure. In an official letter, written early in 1871, Dean Stanley spoke of the Revision as "now set on foot by two Companies of English, Scottish, and Irish scholars." In the final draft of the agreement, proposed by the University Presses, August 3, 1877, the expression "American Churches" is twice used, the term being explained to mean "all religious bodies in the United States which use the present Authorized Version in their public services." Referring to this intercommunal fellowship, Professor Lightfoot wrote, "This coöperation is a matter for great thankfulness. It may be accepted as a guarantee that the work undertaken is not with any narrow sectarian aim but in the broad interests of truth."

Equally notable and cordial was the invitation which led to the constitution of the American Committee. The task of taking the preliminary steps to its formation was confided

to a non-Comformist, one with whom English was an acquired tongue but who was known personally perhaps to a wider constituency of English and Scottish churchmen than any other American scholar of his time. Of that appointment and in the broad spirit of Christian recognition Bishop McIlvaine, replying to the invitation to join the New Testament Company, wrote to Dr. Schaff May 20, 1871, "I am glad that as the Revision in England was set on foot by a Convocation of the Church of England and is proceeding mainly under such guidance and control, and in constituting an American Committee to coöperate, the work of formation has been given by the British Committee, to a *non-Episcopalian and to you*. This will greatly help, not only the all-sidedness of the work but, in case it shall be desirable to introduce it into substitution for the present Version, will very materially prepare the way for such a result." The organizing rules adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury, 1870, laid down the principle that the invitation to coöperate included eminent scholars "to whatever nation or religious body they may belong." Referring to this ecumenical spirit Dr. Schaff used to say that it was most remarkable that "the proud Church of England"—alluding to its high heritage and venerable history—"should call in non-Conformists to sit on a par with its bishops and other scholars who were fully capable of doing the work of Revision without help from outside." As for the American Revisers who represented different denominations, they sat together for a dozen years in undisturbed fellowship and increasing regard for one another. It should be borne in mind that the Revised Version brought to an end the denominational enterprises of Bible translation which had been carried on within the Baptist and Unitarian bodies.

2. It is to the credit of Christian scholarship that it ventured to undertake a revision of King James' Version, endeared to the English-speaking peoples as a sacred volume, and also as a model of pure English. The compelling pur-

pose was one of the conscience. The sole aim was the promotion of truth by providing, as the Preface of 1885 put it, "a faithful rendering of the meaning of the original documents." The greater accuracy of the Revised New Testament has not been called in question. When Bishop Wilberforce declared that the only criticism made against it was "that it was too well done" he had in mind its fidelity to the original. As for the competency of the British Companies for their task Dr. Schaff pronounced the following opinion: "I do not hesitate to say that in ability, learning, tact, and experience their membership is superior to any previous combination for a similar purpose." In his attack on the Revised Bible Dr. Charles A. Briggs pronounced the damning charge that it is "a Scholars' Version, not a Peoples' Version." Whether there be ground for the charge or not, it may be safely affirmed that it was furthest from the intent of the Revisers to disturb the popular idiom of the English Bible. The purpose, by which the American Revisers were actuated, finds expression in a record the Committee made at one of its meetings in 1885. It runs thus: "Those who have labored in the preparation of the Revised English Version have carefully and conscientiously examined and reexamined every verse and sentence and word" and "entrusting it to the future, wish only that their labors may contribute, in this generation and the coming ones, to make the Scriptures, in their true meaning, clearer to all men of the English race."

PITTSBURGH, PA.

V

EVOLUTION TO-DAY—ITS MEANING AND TENDENCY

J. WESLEY MILLER

Everywhere there is dissatisfaction with present-day culture. A generation ago it was confidently predicted that the golden age would soon appear. The International Tribunal at the Hague would amicably adjust all the disputes among the nations. That there would soon be a United States of Nations—A World Brotherhood—was confidently believed by many. Science, Industry, technical education, and a Christless religion would rejuvenate society. The World War came and all such hopes were shattered, like a delicate vase dashed upon flinty rock. Has not the exploitation and failure of all merely humanitarian schemes for betterment of the human race constituted a negative proof of the absoluteness of Christianity? Do the comforts afforded by wealth satisfy the inner needs of man, or compensate for the emptiness of life without Christ?

Humanity seems overwhelmed by a wave of rebellion against authority and order. This wave of resentment against things orderly has been aptly called "The Rebellion of the Incompetent." Is it not significant that the presidents¹ of the three great universities, in their baccalaureate addresses to the graduating classes of 1922, centered their remarks upon the moral laxity of the nation? As touching religion, one of the presidents said "Traditional religion is under fire. Many prosperous and worldly minded individuals find it possible to disregard it altogether as intrinsically inconvenient. Others of a more intellectual cast

¹ President James Rowland Angell of Yale; President John Grier Hibben of Princeton; President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard.

regard it as a remnant of the superstition of primitive man, and, as such, beyond the serious consideration of the educated. Still more serious, clamant defendants of particular religious views proclaim a fatal clash with the teachings of science and attempt to compel the young student to choose between the denial of scientific evidence and the acceptance of the true Religion." Has there not been too much drifting with the crowd, too little, clear, concise, and generous thinking, too much law violation for the good of the country and its people?

Every kind of infidelity is prevalent and fond of sheltering itself behind nature. From the ordinary skeptic to the outright agnostic this is true. They are worshippers of nature. Anything that will eliminate the God of nature will claim their head trust and heart trust. Hence, the tendency to think lightly of the supernatural; to deny miracles and to look askance at the startling accomplishments of the great Jehovah. With such persons, science, as related to the origin of the external world and the creation of man, becomes a cherished term. For them, Evolution is the open door to the winding labyrinths of nature and the key to every moral problem. Evolution of to-day may mean much or little. It depends upon one's viewpoint. That there is a vast difference of opinion among philosophic thinkers on the subject, the many definitions prove. In its broadest sense, Evolution attempts to explain the origin of the universe, the beginning of our earth, with all the planets, animals, living, and extinct, including man with his physical and mental nature. Evolution, like everything else that does not spring up in a night, has a history. Charles Darwin was not the original exponent of Evolution. In a general way, the ideas relating to the origin of the species and the changes which species undergo were surmised by numerous thinkers from Lucretius to Roger Bacon; from Bacon to Goethe, DeCandolle the Elder, Lamarck, Buffon, and Chambers. Many ideas which Darwin expressed were foreshadowed by these

savants. The doctrine of Evolution is a growth to which Charles Darwin was only one of the many contributors. In his *Philosophie Zoologique* (Paris, 1809) Lamarck says "That organisms arose from germs; that development was from the simple to the complex; that the animal series was not continuous but tree like."

Early in 1852, Herbert Spencer advocated Evolution from the viewpoint of philosophy. In his *Principles of Biology*, he uses the word in both a philosophical and a scientific sense. The essence of his view is that there is a continual change in the organized world from the generalized to the specialized.

In 1859, Charles Darwin, the greatest English naturalist of the nineteenth century, turned the attention of the scientific world to the views of Evolution. The two bases of Darwinism are natural selection of the fittest and the hereditary transmission of characteristics acquired in the struggle for existence.

In general, Evolution may be divided into Inorganic, Organic, and Mental.

Under Inorganic may be comprised the evolution of the material universe, the solar system, the gradual development of the planets from raw material through the different gaseous stages of nebulae.

Organic Evolution needs to be very carefully defined. In reference to the use of the term, there is a wide difference of opinion. Sometimes the term is applied to the ordinary growth of a plant from a seed, or a bird from an egg. Sometimes it is used to denote a gradual development without any outside agency—by means of forces residing within—of some primordial germ unfolding into all the varied forms of life now existent. Sometimes it is used to mean Causal—that is, the cause of all life. Sometimes it is used as Modal—that is, the method by which a Personal Creator has brought about all the various forms of life. This view holds that, from a low form of matter, the Creator evolved

life. By a constant succession of transformations of species, life passed into higher forms, until finally mankind was reached. This view claims that man descended less directly from all the lower forms of life, and more immediately from a common ancestor with the anthropoid apes. The Modal view of Organic Evolution is the only possible way in which the term may be used in a Theistic and Christian sense.

Mental Evolution is an attempt to account for the origin of the intellectual qualities of man. This view holds that the intellectual qualities of man have originated from the lower animals. Some writers on this view claim that, in the last analysis, it is impossible to draw the line between the mental acts of man and of animals. The mental, moral, and spiritual nature of man is said to be developed from the simple, elementary mental qualities of animals. After a low stage of intelligence had been developed, man gradually attained a gross materialistic conception of religion; then followed nature worship, polytheism, monotheism; the worship of goodness or God; the love of fellow man, with faith, hope, and love. From certain *new lines* of inquiry the so-called modern world view is developed. What are these new lines of inquiry? To be specific, they are the new literary-historical criticism of Scripture, the new natural science, the new psychology, the new ethics, the new sociology, and the consequent new philosophies and theologies. According to the new historical criticism—the so-called Higher Criticism—how are the Books of the Bible regarded? They are regarded as primarily an evolution of the human mind and not a revelation of the Divine Mind. What becomes of special revelation, of inspiration, of all prophecy, and miracles? They are ruled out as inconsistent with human freedom. What becomes of all scripture that implies the opposite view? It is set aside as unauthentic. From this viewpoint, how is the Bible regarded? It is reduced to the common level of a merely human production.

In the realms of matter and mind, according to the new

natural science, as usually taught, the reign of natural law is universal. How does the new science claim that the universe originated? Not in time, but evolved from eternity by some latent force or energy. The mineral, the plant, the animal, man and God Himself are but the successive stages of a never ceasing, materialistic, energetic process. What does the new psychology hold? It holds that the soul is not an abiding entity, but a mere stream of consciousness, a series of mere passing states. As the soul is dependent upon matter, what becomes of it at death? It vanishes. According to the new psychology of religion, how is regeneration regarded? Not as a profound change of heart, due to the spirit of God, but merely a psychical phenomenon of the adolescent state, or the outgrowth of unusual emotion and excitement.

What does the ordinary comparative religion teach? It teaches that the various religions have ascended naturally from totemism, animism, polytheism, up to monothiesim and Christianity. How is Christianity regarded? It is regarded as the highest, but not the final religion. Similar un-Biblical premises and conclusions characterize much of the current science. As a result of these historical, scientific, and psychological investigations there has arisen an old philosophy in a new setting. One writer calls it the new Humanism, Professor William James names it Pragmatism, Eucken says it is Activism, and Bergson terms it Vitalism. In varying degree, but with substantially the same fundamental conception, toward what channel are these later philosophies drifting? Toward the channel of what may be called Energetic Monism. What is the meaning of this term? It is the doctrine that not God but an impersonal energy is back of all things. On this subject an ex-president² of an Eastern institution of learning writes, "The scientific doctrine of one omnipresent, eternal Energy is fundamentally and completely inconsistent with a dualistic

² C. W. Eliot of Harvard in *Religion of the Future*, page 18.

conception which sets spirit over against matter, good over against evil, man's wickedness against God's righteousness and Satan against Christ." Is not the distinction between matter and mind, right and wrong obliterated? Is not this a clear identity-hypothesis of spirit and matter, good and evil, Christ and Satan?

As the writer, to which reference is made, is a fair type of the anti-traditional view, we quote again from him: "The religion of the future will have in it nothing of the Supernatural." From this statement is it not clear that the author means to say that there is no supreme person to originate laws or direct the movement to a definite goal? Again the same author boldly affirms: "If God is thoroughly immanent in the entire creation, there can be no secondary causes either in the natural or spiritual universe." This is a clear type of the new Pantheism. What, may we ask, is the chief characteristic of the new Pantheism? The denial of all secondary causes. The word God is retained, but in the sense of a mere Energy, a finite God who never intervenes in the world history by miracle or prophecy.

A careful examination of the textbooks on biology, psychology, geology, and history discloses the fact that many of the prominent scientists in the United States have discarded belief in a personal God and personal immortality. They have substituted, instead, an *impersonal* "energy" called *Monism*. What is the underlying thought of this new school? It is this—man is *not* a sinner, a fallen being, but a creature of exalted rank, capable, by an evolutionary process of becoming immune from sin, of working out his own destiny without Bible, Atonement, or Saviour. Instead of the historic interpretation of man created in the image of God, endowed with God-breathed soul, having immortality essentially bound up within him, man is regarded just as an improved beast. Instead of sin being rebellion against the Creator, and having an inherent evil tendency, deserving the wrath of God, sin is regarded as a mere trifling

thing, the evidence of an awakening, a step upward. Instead of the Bible being a revelation from God, infallibly given, it is taught that the Bible is no revelation at all. Instead of truth being ascertainable and approachable, it is taught that it lies just beyond us. It can never be reached. It is not possessed absolutely, nor can it be so possessed. From this viewpoint there is therefore no certainty; all is conjecture; there is no anchor of the soul entering into that within the veil.

As this view sees in man only an improved beast, so it sees in Christ only an improved man. The difference is one of degree. Instead of the future being outlined by the Christ, the Son of God, and as explained by inspired men, the Biblical prophecies become apocalyptic fancies that have no remote value in a possible fulfillment. So that mankind is still in the world groping in gloom without a guide, a bestial ancestry to look back to, and an expectation shrouded in uncertainty.

In his book entitled *The Science of Power*, Benjamin Kidd, an English writer, declares that Bernhardt made Darwinism the basis that "might makes right." What other interpretation can be given to the doctrine embodied in the "survival of the fittest"? Can we escape the logical conclusion that a form of the doctrine of Evolution was the real cause of the world's most gigantic war? Darwin himself complained that civilized man weakens the race by caring for the weak, whereas the savages eliminated the weak, leaving only the strong. His theory is that our sympathies will not allow us to apply the "hard reason," and that we must, therefore, bear the undoubted, bad effects of the weak surviving and propagating their kind. When Nietzsche denounced Christianity, he only carried out the spirit of Darwinism. If Darwinism is sound, does it not logically follow that Christianity impairs the future by substituting love for hatred? From this viewpoint, should one weak nation complain if another strong nation violates treaties

and crosses frontiers with an armed force and destroys the defenseless and outrages the innocent? Is it not fulfilling the instinct by evolutionary process of growth?

Is not the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest" making the industrial situation of the world such a menace as it never was before? Has there ever been, since the birth of Christ, so much class consciousness in the members of the two groups known as the capitalist group and the labor group? Have there ever been so many who look forward with a vague dread to what they regard as an inevitable conflict?

What can save the world from the gross materialism that tends to make each man regard his brother from the *brute* standpoint, instead of the viewpoint of a brother? A return to a belief in a *personal* God. How did Christ describe the need of His day and ours? He proclaimed as the first great Commandment: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. Philosophy sought to preserve the moral character by improving the ethics, Christianity reversed the order and by that revolutionized human thought.

For what certain, definite tenets does the Church stand? God, the Supreme Being, Creator of the universe, the inspiration of Scripture, Sin as a poison in the soul, an estrangement from God, moral pollution, Jesus Christ as an historical personage, the efficacy of the blood of Christ to save man through faith, eternal life. Is there not a great gulf between modernism and the teaching of the Church? Does not the new Energetic Monism tend to undermine the whole Christian system?

What is the trend of thought in the large universities of the land? A careful study reveals the fact that the trend to a large extent, is either fundamentally indifferent to Christianity or is out of relation with it. There is a theory that social ethics will save society. Japan had a code of ethics twenty-five hundred years before Christ was born, but not

until missionaries of the Cross carried the Gospel message—that man is of more value than sheep—was the social condition in Japan materially improved. To what is modern indifference to Christianity due? Partly to the materialism of the age, the love of pleasure, and superficial thought. But the real cause, however, is of a scholastic and intellectual character. This intellectual temper is often onesided or ignorantly critical. Can a stream be materially different from the fountain head? Every phase of modern life is affected by the trend of thought in the centers of influence. Is it not true that what the universities teach in one generation is proclaimed broadcast the next? The new views are disseminated with ease by the scientific, popular, and semi-popular magazines.

Is it not possible so to present the underlying principles of physics and psychology that people of average intelligence may understand that *true* science is not necessarily destructive of Christianity? While the minister need not preach science, yet should not he be so familiar with the whole field that he can give correct interpretation of Holy Writ, and be able to impart intelligent information relative to the attitude of *true* science and the monistic tendency in current science? Should the student leave the Theological Seminary without a firm grip on the modern, scientific trend, and its bearing on Christianity? Is not the issue clear cut and definite? On the one hand, a personal God, an inspired Bible, a special revelation, the deity of Christ, the Church a divine institution, and salvation through Christ. On the other hand, an impersonal energy, no special revelation, Christ merely an exalted creature, the Church only a human institution, and man capable of saving himself. The trouble in the world to-day is not political, but religious. The conflict is between Christ and the world, between religion and so-called science. It is a question of metaphysics and theology, and along these lines the problem must be solved.

Should not the young minister leaving the Theological

Seminary have adequate preparation that he will not regard the method of development known as evolution as necessarily materialistic and foreign to the idea of the Divine plan in creation? He should be able to point out the difference between the *true* development of the natural world, directed by an All-wise Personal God, and the popular view of *energetic monism*. He who rears the exquisite purity and fragrance of the lily from the black mud of the pond may not disdain very humble paths for the unfolding of the universe. Just what these paths have been God has not always seen fit to declare in detail. But He invites inquiry, and where this is reverent and patient, He amply rewards it. Were not Galileo and Kepler abundantly rewarded? While some of their conclusions were revolutionary to the thought of their times, yet when rightly understood, did they not add rather than subtract from man's evidence of God's being and goodwill? To denounce the scientific investigations, the minister needs to be very sure of his position, lest he, unconsciously, show that he is meddling with something he does not understand. On partial knowledge, he may reach conclusions that will set limits to God's power and ingenuity, and thus belittle God rather than exalt Him. For his hearers, it may result in a belief in a God too small for His world, the immensities of which are being newly revealed with each increase of telescopic power and every new astronomical instrument. The minister should be in the front, and his teaching should also be in the front. His teaching may be steeped in the literature of the past, yet it must have full sympathy of the life and thought of to-day. Let science make its researches in God's great Book of Nature. Are not such investigations interesting and profitable? Let it be granted that it might take ages to make rocks by precipitation and crystallization; that the Creator is dependent on the laws of chemistry for results. But, does He Who made the laws of chemistry need to ask assistance from His own works? In a sense, a miracle is just a short process of nature's

slower operations. Shall God, with the perfections of immensity, omnipotence, and omniscience, be circumscribed in His plans and limited in His methods? Shall God, who upholds the unpillared chambers of the sky, who could create a million worlds in a single moment, be unable to make man by special creation from the dust of the earth? Is not the scientific investigator, who so far forgets the boundaries of his calling as to use natural data for dogmatic affirmations about morals and religion, as perverse and illogical as the minister who maligns true, scientific learning because it does not agree with his theological predilections?

Not all modern thought is anti-Christian. If rightly understood, much of it is available for the minister; but none of it should be neglected or ignored. Through modern scientific research the Darwinian Evolution theory has been materially modified. The principle, so carefully worked out by Darwin, is being given less and less weight by the scientists. Some of the followers of Darwin are trying to retain evolution while rejecting arguments, which led Darwin to accept it as an explanation of the varied life on the planet. It is now claimed that evolution moves by leaps and bounds, as well as by uniform, slow processes. There are many wide gaps for which evolution can give no account. Elie DeCyon, a Russo-French scientist, for many years a member of the faculty of science at St. Petersburg (Petrograd), in his work, "God and Science," says, "The two bases of Darwinism, natural selection of the fittest and the hereditary transmission of characteristics, acquired in the struggle for existence have been broken down by two Evolutionists—Herbert Spencer and August Weismann." If, as Spencer and Weismann claim, acquired characteristics are not inherited, does not the dogma of natural selection lose all support?

When, for the first time, DeCyon showed Claude Bernard, a French Physiologist, the marvelous mechanism of the cardiac nerves, especially the depressor, the nerve which trans-

mits to the brain all emotions of the heart and at the same time watches over its well being by regulating its action and by warning the vasomotor of the brain, at the suggestion of danger, the first words of Claude Bernard were, "I should like to know how the Darwinists would undertake to explain such wonderful mechanisms with the aid of adaptation or selection." In his remarkable Biological investigation, Oscar Hertwig, a German Embryologist, insists that animals differ among themselves, as much in their germ cells as in their full-formed organisms. Does this not render improbable, if not impossible, a common origin of different animals from the same cell? What forces are inherent in the germ cell directing its development through the cycle of its law-fixed modifications? DeCyon says, "We have not advanced a single step toward its solution."

Oscar Fraas, a German Geologist, who devoted a long life to the study of fossil animals, says, "There is no proof that man descended from a Simian species; no proof of this theory can ever be given from discovered fossils." Rudolph Virchow, a great German Pathologist and Anthropologist, says, "I have never found a single ape's skull which approaches at all the human skull. Between man and apes there exists a line of sharp demarcation. If we compare known fossil men with men of to-day, we can boldly affirm that individuals of a low development are much more numerous, relatively, among present-day men, than among fossils."

In his book on *Naturalism and Religion* Dr. Rudolph Otto, a man who combines a high philosophic discipline with an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the science of organic nature, after quoting some of the modified views of Evolutionists, says, "All this implies an admission of evolution and of descent, but also a setting aside of Darwinism proper as an unsuccessful hypothesis, and a *positive* recognition of an endeavor after internal causes and teleology in nature, as against fortuitous and superficial factors. Does not this open up a vista into the background of things?

Does it not thereby yield to the religious conception all that a study of nature can yield—an acknowledgment of the possibility and legitimacy of interpreting the world in a religious sense—and does it not lend assistance in so doing?"

To-day, even the Modal type of Organic Evolution is being modified. May one not legitimately ask: Did all life spring from one cell or two, one for the plant and one for the animal? If two, may one not ask, why not more? What is the earliest plant form known? The Algæ, seaweeds. Yet scientists tell us that during vast ages this species has remained essentially unchanged. It abounds to-day in the same form. A short time ago, the Superintendent of the Department of Natural History in the British Museum declared that in all that great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. He says the theory is not founded on evidence and wholly unsupported by fact.

In his work "No Struggle for Existence," George Paulin, a life-long Evolutionist of the Modal type, says: "Without struggle for existence, without suffering and without internecine conflict, nature has a way of eliminating her excess of production. The only evolutionary power of nature, known to true science, is that which is exerted by its changed environment; when, by any compelling cause, a group of animals is forced to migrate and come under new, external conditions, certain changes in the habits of the animal world would take place. These would call into play new functional activities, and entail the suspension of old ones. Certain structural elements would be developed while, for want of use, others would become atrophied and dwindle into rudimentary proportions. But from observation and experience, so far as we can trace its effects, nature's evolutionary agency is unable to pass beyond the bounds of a single family to originate a new generic type."

In every geological era, many modern scientists see endeavors of ascent in the scale of organic being. They trace

its rising ever upward from geologic age to geologic age, until it ends in man. From bottom to top of the ascending scale of life the geologic record does not convey to their mind the slightest hint or suggestion that the higher forms of life have been evolved from lower. What intervenes between the mollusks and crustaceans to help us understand how the first fish forms were evolved? Nothing. What intervenes between the fish and the first bird forms? Nothing. What intervenes between the first bird forms and the first mammals? Nothing. "By its very mystery," says Paulin, "the way of God in creation baffles me. Of the mode of evolution nature tells us nothing."

Paulin records this remarkable fact. Some years ago, a fossil feather was discovered in a rock system, which, at the time of the discovery, was supposed to have been destitute of feathered life, but in which a few bird forms have since been found. This feather is as perfect as those of the present-day eagle.

In searching for the origin of matter, life, and spirit, the Christian philosopher discovers only one word—the Hebrew—"Bara"—for the act of creation as distinct from that of making or molding from materials. Is it not significant that this word, in the Biblical account of Creation, occurs only three times and in connection with three spheres? (1) *In the sphere of matter*—In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, Gen. 1:1. (2) *In the sphere of life*—And God created the great sea monsters, and every living creature that moveth wherewith the waters swarmed, and after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind, Gen. 1:21. (3) *In the sphere of man*—And God created man, in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them, Gen. 1:27.

Is there not a great gulf between matter and nothing? Can science bridge that gulf? Is there not a great gulf between life and non-living? Can science bridge that gulf? Is there not a great gulf between man and the lower crea-

tion? Can science bridge that gulf? Alfred Russel Wallace who, with Charles Darwin, was a pioneer in the modern evolutionary theory very clearly states that there must have been three interpositions of a Divine and Supernatural power, to account for these things as they are.

In Comparative Anatomy we are told that types of life go up from the lowest to the highest; that they are determined by the proportion of the amount of brains to the spinal cord. The order is fish, reptiles, birds, mammals, man. Does not the first chapter of Genesis give the same order of events? Yet Genesis is not a book that gives us scientific knowledge of astronomy, geology, botany, and anthropology.

Does not Genesis clearly show development in harmony with modern teaching on Evolution? The universe had a beginning; it did not always exist; Light was in existence before the appearance of sun and moon; the earth was once covered with water; plant life preceded animal life; man appeared on the earth only when it was ready for him. In regard to man's nature, does not Genesis have points of contact with biological and anthropological teaching? Is not man united with nature and yet separate from it? Like Genesis, does not anthropology bear witness to man's complex nature, implying a complex origin? Is physiology adequate to account for man? It certainly does not account for his highly developed intelligence. Must not psychology be predicated also? The mind alone is a proof that both elements—the physical and the mental—are required. The brain is at once physical and the seat of the mind. Who can explain how the physical, gray matter of the brain is connected with the non-physical element of mind? No one.

Are we at all surprised that since the world war, a counter wave toward Christianity is setting in, even in high, scientific circles? In one of his recent writings (*Harv. Rev.*, V, p. 276) Eucken says: "In proportion as man has advanced outwardly he has retrograded inwardly. We work and

work, and know not to what end; for in giving up eternity we have lost every inner bond of the ages and all power of comprehensive view. Without a guiding star we drift on the waves of time."

In his work on *Creative Evolution* Henri Bergson says: "Apart from the question to what extent the theory of evolution describes the facts, and to what extent it symbolizes them, there is nothing in it that is irreconcilable with the doctrine it has aimed to replace, even with that of Special Creation, to which it is usually opposed."

In *Evolution, the Bible and Religion*,³ Frederic J. Gurney says: "In the first chapter of Genesis itself the evident aim is to set forth God as the Creator and Man, as made in His image, the crown of the creative process, whom God set over the work of His hands."

As the religion founded by our Lord Jesus Christ is in essence the same in the twentieth century as in the first, and not the result of any human evolutionary process, as a concession to modern thought, is it necessary or even expedient to abandon any of the time-honored doctrines and tenets embraced in the so-called Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian creeds?

As our conception of Christianity is susceptible to change from age to age, and as every system of doctrine is formulated along the lines of contemporaneous science and philosophy, should the Church and especially the theological seminaries seriously consider the need of reformulating the essentials of Christianity in the light of contemporaneous science and philosophy?

In a greater or less degree, theological seminaries of to-day offer courses in Apologetics, Christian Ethics, and Evidences. Has not the time arrived for the introduction of a larger number of courses in "The New Apologetics" including Psychology of Religion, Comparative Religion, Philosophy of Religion, Old Testament Higher Criticism, and

³ The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

recent Philosophy in its bearing on Christianity and especially the hypothesis of Evolution in its relation to Christianity?

A recent writer, who possesses the quality of acute discernment, suggests that those who are inclined, without knowledge of the facts of the case, to accept what they call the doctrine of Monism—an *impersonal energy* back of all things—may be asked to answer these questions:

1. Why is it that life has never been produced from that which is non-living? Science *emphatically* declares that there never has been any spontaneous generation.

2. Why is it that the embryonic, immature life has no power to reproduce itself? Eggs never hatch eggs. There is no reproduction without maturity.

3. Why is it that embryonic life is also unimprovable? To try to improve the embryonic life is to endanger its very existence.

4. Why is it that embryonic, immature life is also incapable of preservation? Almost anything will crush it out of existence. A scientist admitted, not long ago, that if embryonic life had come into the earth's chaotic state, it certainly would have been destroyed.

Where the materialistic evolutionist sees nothing but accident, matter, and blind force, the Christian philosopher beholds the clear evidence of supernatural wisdom. Haeckel may exultingly assure us that his Monism has shattered the dogmas of the Christian Religion. He may tell us that there is no longer a personal God; no immortality of the soul and no freedom of the will. As some one has said, he may bid us take heart and find comfort in the cult of the good, the beautiful, the true. Is not such teaching like feeding on the wind?

What is the greatest uplifting force in human life, both individual and social, at the present time? It is Christ's living, personality over men's thoughts, conduct, and character. Christ is more than the product of evolutionary proc-

esses; He is more than an improved man or even an ultimate man; He is the personal revelation of the Father's love. He is the supreme, outstanding fact of history. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Amid all the superficial talk about human ideals, reached through evolutionary processes, that has become so commonplace to-day, is it not well to remember that so long as there are dreams of future possibilities and not faith in present realities, so long as these dreams are mere self painting of the yearning spirit, and not its personal surrender to the immediate communion with the Infinite Perfection through Christ, they have no more solidity or steadfastness than floating soap bubbles, beautiful in sunshine, soon to be broken by the passing wind? So long as you are hemmed in by the mere phantoms of your own thoughts you do not so much as touch the threshold of true religion. The very gateway of entrance to it is the discovery that your gleaming ideal is the everlasting real. It is the abiding presence and personal persuasion of Him Who says—I AM THE WAY, AND THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE.

PLYMOUTH, OHIO

VI

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

A More Honorable Man. By Arthur Somers Roche. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York, 1922. Price, \$2.00.

This is a novel of 290 pages divided into 25 chapters. The aim of the book is to set forth the social conditions and prevailing spirit in present-day society of our country. The author employs two leading characters for his purpose. He introduces matters among men and women that are not usually written about in books for general circulation. Upon the whole, I believe the moral influence of the book upon its readers will be wholesome; though some things may be regarded as of doubtful propriety.

According to the author's theory persons are not to be judged alike, because they are not alike. Some persons are so constituted by nature that they are fuller of life than others, and as a consequence are subjected to more temptations and greater temptations than others, and in passing judgment upon their waywardness and wrong doings these things are to be taken into consideration. That, no doubt, is true, and yet the danger of such teaching is that transgressors of the moral law may hide themselves behind their natural constitution and seek to exonerate themselves by it.

The prominent character of the book is employed to represent the predominant spirit of the age. He is a young man who has no desire for a college education. Business looms up before his mind as the great aim of life. The accumulation of wealth is his ruling thought. He is a man of vision. He looks out upon the world and obtains an accurate and comprehensive view of its conditions, and then he makes his business meet those conditions. The result is that he makes money. And as conditions in society change he changes his business, and continues to add largely

to his growing wealth. As a multi-millionaire he gets to New York and engages in various business enterprises. He resorts to schemes and smart business dealings to accomplish his financial purposes. He becomes involved with scheming women, and uses them to further his aims. He keeps within the requirements of the Law, but his whole course is a selfish one, governed by the one purpose of gaining wealth. He allows and even causes his friends to suffer, he sacrifices his true relation to his wife, and his obligations to his children. And he sacrifices his own character, for he is not a true friend, or true father, or true husband. And yet that is called success.

The more honorable man is a person whose life and works are ordered on an entirely opposite principle. He has consideration for the conditions and experiences of others. When, for example, the former character becomes involved with a young girl of the full life he satisfies his mind by paying the money required. The pain and suffering of the other party seem not to concern him. The more honorable man will marry the girl, relieve her of the anguish and anxiety as much as possible and take the full share of the suffering upon himself. And so throughout life he will himself suffer rather than have suffering come upon others. In other words, he devotes his life to the service of others at the sacrifice of his own ease and comfort and pleasure. The more honorable man, instead of a life of selfishness and greed, will live a life of service. Such a life is admired and praised by nearly everyone and yet the contrary spirit is so prevalent and strong among men and women generally that the majority are carried along in its stream. I commend this book not simply to be read but its characters to be studied and the lessons they teach to be learned.

A. E. TRUXAL

Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion, with Special Reference to Dante's "Divine Comedy." By Dr. Kaufman Kohler, President Emeritus, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, author of "Jewish Theology," etc. The Macmillan Company, New York, Publishers.

This is a book of only 158 pages, but it contains a large amount of knowledge in a condensed form. Besides a preface and introduction it treats of the following nine chapters: 1. Dante and the Old Testament; 2. Hell and Heaven in Babylonian and Egyptian Literature; 3. Hell and Heaven in Hindu and Persian Literature; 4. Hades and Elysium in Greek and Roman Literature; 5. Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament; 6. Gehenna and Paradise in the Apocalyptic Literature in the New Testament; 7. Gehenna and Paradise in Rabbinic and Mohammedan Literature; 8. Hell, Heaven, and Purgatory in Medieval Literature; 9. The Divine Comedy in the light of modern thought.

These topics at once indicate the broad view which the author has taken of his subject. The time was when Judaism and Christianity were regarded by their adherents as original religions, independent of all others. Judaism claimed to be the true religion over against all gentile religions and the only relation it sustained to them was to judge and condemn them. Christianity in its turn has taken the same position. But modern knowledge compels us to modify those narrow views. There is an important sense in which we can speak of the religion of mankind as one religion that has manifested itself under various forms. This does not mean that Judaism was not superior to the religions of other nations, and that Christianity is not superior to all other religions; but it does mean that all religions sustain inner relations to each other. The author of this book traces the conceptions of Heaven and Hell through the earliest religions down to the present and points out the influence which earlier conceptions had upon the later ones. The Divine Comedy was the embodiment of the medieval conceptions of Heaven and Hell and the author regards it

"as the last link in the chain of ideas and views which held sway over all the preceding ages. In tracing its sources we must not stop at Vergil and Homer, but take cognizance of the fact that, alongside of and behind these, there were, on the one hand, Plato, Pythagoras, and the Orphic Mysteries, and on the other hand, the extensive Egyptian, Babylonian, Hindu, and Persian Literature which furnished them themes for their compositions and their concepts of cosmic life." Again along the same general line the author says: "That the Persian or Zoroastrian religion, with its sharp contrast between the principles of good and evil, was the main factor in shaping the eschatological views of Judaism, Christianity, and Islamism is today generally recognized." These quotations indicate the use the author makes of other religions in order to understand properly the literature of our Bible. Some religious literature is older than that of the Bible. The Hammurabic code of laws dates to the time of Abraham, and he and his descendants no doubt were acquainted with many of its requirements. And that the mind of Moses was influenced more or less by it when he was inspired to formulate a code for the children of Israel may easily be understood. The conceptions held in past ages of the physical world of mankind, of God, of Satan, and of the future life with its heaven and hell were gathered up in their final form in the medieval age by the poet Dante in his *Divine Comedy*. And from that day those conceptions began gradually to lose their hold on the minds and hearts of the people. Today the mind of the Christian world does not entertain that ancient view of God and heaven, and of the devil and hell which held sway through so many long centuries. Dante's great work proved a "swan song." Our author says: "Contrasted with our cosmic system, our ethical and social concepts of life, we look upon the whole of medievalism as a curiosity, as if presented to us in a museum of antiquity. Unless we purposely shut our eyes and ears to the revelations of the modern era since Coper-

nicus and Newton, Kant and Darwin—and there is none so blind as he who will not see, and none so deaf as he who will not hear—Dante's world view is as remote from ours as is the child age from that of mature manhood. It is difficult for us to realize the entire structure of the universe as conceived by ancient and medieval times, when the vault of heaven with its three or seven stories served as the dwelling place of the Deity with its court of angels or inferior gods around and beneath, and when the corresponding nether world beneath earth, the abode of men and beasts, with its three or seven chambers was inhabited by the shades of men and the infernal demons. How easily could then a fertile imagination work out a plan for a continuance of the shadowy life of these, either in the dark region below or in the brighter realms of the heavens above, to make it a question of damnation or salvation to be decided by the ruling church! Surely, our enlightened world has outgrown this conception of the cosmos. Our universe with its infinitude of space and time, in which orbs of light without number swing in endless æons through distances far beyond the grasp of the human mind around some unknown center, has no upper or lower sphere, no celestial or infernal region to localize either the Deity or its counterpart, the devil, with their hosts." Our author believes in a heaven and a hell, but his conceptions of them are of a different nature from those of medieval times. He also believes that we are "in the birth-throes of a new era of humanity." "We must be re-born to a new faith in God and man. We need a new inspiration." This is a book that bears studying. We need not agree with every position he takes. In some respects he is too radical for me. He does not carry out his conception of Heaven and Hell fully, and does not describe the future life as he apprehends it. However, that did not properly belong to his purpose. His subject was Heaven and Hell in comparative religion and that subject he treated positively, fully but tersely.

A. E. TRUXAL

Where the Higher Criticism Fails. A Critique of the Destructive Critics.
By W. H. Fitchett. The Methodist Book Concern, New York.

The author of this work divides his subject into four books: Book I, The Position of the Higher Criticism, in three chapters; Book II, The Bible, in seven chapters; Book III, On Miracles, in four chapters; Book IV, Christ and the Critics, in five chapters.

A legion of writers have entered the sphere of Higher Criticism. Books and articles of all kinds and character have been produced in this department of investigation and study. As our author holds, some of these writings are "sane" and some are wild. The subjects which Higher Criticism treats are of such a nature that they may be viewed from so many different standpoints and under such a variety of aspects that the results produced necessarily become very various. Many different views are expressed and different conclusions reached. Opponents of Higher Criticism, as our author also does, find fault with it because its advocates do not agree among themselves. This is true, and it is well that it is true. And yet it is also true that on many of the main questions at issue there is a very general agreement. Our author says for himself: "We believe, that is—in a wider or narrower sense—in the compositive structure of the first five books of the Bible. We have learned, again, to recognize the human element in the Bible, and the progressive nature of the revelation given in it." He further says: "The Higher Criticism, again, has helped to deliver the faith of some people from the theory of an inspiration hard, mechanical, and strictly verbal, a theory which required us to believe that the mind of the prophet and apostle, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit resembled nothing so much as a machine, a phonograph record, reproducing with machine-like accuracy, certain words." With the foregoing statements and on other questions the Higher Critics agree practically unanimously. Our author charges the Higher Critics with facing in two directions—sometimes maintaining traditional views and at other times

advocating progressive ones. It seems to me that he is open to the same charge as sometimes he is with the critics and sometimes against them.

The third chapter of Book I he entitles, "*The Dancing Dervish Variety of the Higher Criticism*," in which he analyzes and criticises an article in the Hibbert Journal by Professor Preserved Smith on the subject: A new light on the relations of Peter and Paul. If he properly represents Professor Smith's article, as no doubt he does, the ridicule which he heaps upon it and the censure he pronounces against it are well merited. But when in chapter one of Book II he undertakes to refute the position of Dr. E. Griffith Jones in his article in Peakes's Commentary on the ultimate standard of religious truth he does not seem to be so successful. In my humble opinion, having read the chapter I concluded that Dr. Jones expressed the truth on the subject rather than W. H. Fitchett. The Mystic relies for final certainty upon the visions furnished him by the "inner light"; the Romanist depends upon the church for his authority as to the truth; the Protestant makes the Bible his final appeal. Dr. Jones regards each of these positions to contain some truth, and yet each to be defective. According to his conception the final authority is to be found in the coöperation of the christian consciousness with the teaching of the Bible. As it seems to me, the position of Dr. Jones remains unshaken by the author's contention.

The chapter on the Bible as a moral code is one of the best in the book. The position taken will no doubt be acceptable to all believers in christianity. The only thing that mars it slightly are a few statements, incidentally made which do not agree with his position taken earlier in the book; such expressions as: "a plan of human duties framed by the mind of God"; "laws of conduct framed by God and made imperative by his will"; a divinely framed code of conduct." Such statements indicate a conception of inspiration which the author himself condemned. What

became of Moses and the Prophets? Were they mere machines in the hands of God?

On the subject of Miracles there are four chapters. The book holds that "the christian faith itself, which rests on miracles and is attested by miracles, stands or falls by the credibility of the miracles it records." I suppose the author has in mind not simply the miracles performed by Jesus as recorded in the gospels, but has taken in a much wider scope of the miraculous. He is not afraid of the theory of evolution. He says: "evolution, so far from making miracles incredible is itself on any reading the greatest of miracles. The original germ which contained all things can not have evolved itself. God must come into the process somewhere, even if only at the beginning and with a single creative act."

The author evidently accepts all the miracles of Jesus literally as recorded. And he seeks to support them by the spiritual miracles performed since the day of Christ and performed at the present time. The conversion of men, women, and children to Christ, the cleansing of their souls from sin, the transformation of character, and the regeneration of human society are miracles of the highest order. "No miracle is equal," he says, "to that which changes the human soul, and the apostles themselves were visibly transfigured men." But it seems to me that granting that these spiritual operations belong to the sphere of the miraculous, they nevertheless are of a different order from the miracles of changing water into wine, cleansing the leper and restoring the dead to life. They can not be explained in the same way. They belong to different categories. And I can readily see that a person might believe that a sinner can be transformed by the grace of the Lord and a nation raised to a higher order of spirituality and morality by the power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and yet question the credibility of the miracles recorded in the New Testament.

This book contains many things that everybody, including the Higher Critics will accept as true. Its main effort how-

ever is to show the failure of Higher Criticism. But I very much doubt whether its strictures and arguments are of sufficient force to cause any scholarly critic to change his views. And I suspect that it will be somewhat confusing to the ordinary mind. And yet I think it is a book that ought to be read. It is beneficial to any scholar to learn how his teaching impresses the minds of all classes of people.

A. E. TRUXAL

The Religion of Science. By William H. Wood, Ph.D., Department of Biblical Literature, Dartmouth College. The Macmillan Company, New York.

This is a book of 176 pages. The author treats his subject in eleven chapters under the following topics: "The Issue"; "The Religion of Science"; "The Canons—Matter—Energy—Mechanism"; "The Control of Law"; "The Sacred Bible of Nature"; "The Creed—Reason"; "The Creed—Evolution"; "The Teachings of Evolution"; "Evolution of Man"; "The Real Christianity"; "Conclusions."

These headings show that the book treats of matters of vital interest at the present stage in the discussion of Science, Philosophy, and Religion. It is not easy reading, especially when the reader is not well versed in the studies of science and philosophy. Unless one has somewhat of a philosophical mind and some philosophical training he is likely to be mystified rather than edified in the reading of the book. Almost every sentence challenges thought and meditation. The book needs to be read several times in succession in order that one may catch the force of the author's reasoning.

The difference between the Religion of Science and the Science of Religion must be kept clearly in mind throughout, as also the distinction between pure science and science-theology. Pure science investigates and studies the physical world as it observes it and experiments with it. The scientist as such does not enter the sphere of metaphysics or theology. The science-theologian employs the facts of sci-

ence to build up a philosophy and theology. The dogmas of science are the conservation of matter, the conservation of energy, the mechanical theory of the world, and the reign of law. The author examines and analyzes these canons critically and thoroughly and satisfies his mind conclusively that they are not absolute in their operations, but have their limitations and that consequently they are insufficient for the basis of a religion. He expresses his conclusions in the following words: "These then are the canons or dogmas upon which the science-theologian founds the conclusions whence he draws his inferences—conservation of matter, conservation of energy, the mechanical theory, and the reign of law. The facts that a critical examination reveals are: true scientists do not regard these as conclusions but as workable hypotheses; they are descriptive phases; they have been made into metaphysical theories by the science-theologian hence taken out of the class *science*; they have never been proved and can not even be scientifically demonstrated, hence can never be classed as scientific conclusions. Inferences based upon such metaphysical thinking must then be evaluated for what they are. The essential point is that to place the authority of science behind such is quite wide of the truth. A religion of science based upon such theories transformed into dogmas rests upon a very unstable foundation." The chapter on the evolution of man is especially interesting. Evolution according to the scientists is a process that works constantly and creatively from the beginning up through all the forms of the natural world until man is produced. They claim man to be the final product, coming under distinct laws of his own, and further that no being higher than man will ever appear upon the earth. In regard to this position the author raises the question: "Evolution is creative and eternally continuous—how then can it come to a climax and place a period in its continuity?" And further he adds: "This teaching requires a heaven to complete it."

The author does not dispute the claim that the theory of evolution has been so thoroughly established that few scholars deem it necessary to defend it with arguments. But he takes the position and defends it that evolution has its *limitations*. It is not absolute in its operations. On the physical side of man—man as an animal—the theory of his evolution seems to be supported by all the known facts in the case. But man is spiritual as well and as really as physical. To him belong intellect, reason, will, the passions of love and hate, and religion. These endowments can not be accounted for by the evolutionary hypothesis. The scientist, however, points to instinct in animals and claims that they constitute the sources out of which reason in its comprehensive sense has been evolved. The author holds that such reasoning makes the mistake of not distinguishing between “moral judgment and the judgments of morality,” and says: “The former is the judgment of the whole and absolute (not a general abstraction), while the latter comprises the results of the exercise of this moral judgment. The latter will vary and grow, and be modified by education and environment while the former abides changeless. Then having slurred over this distinction, the assumption is made of the historical succession from the lower form in instinct to the evolved modification in moral judgment and character. The reasoning, however, must admit a miracle—a long drawn out, slow one, perhaps, or admit identity. If the instinct is different from the moral judgment, then when it is changed it is no longer instinct; if it is morality in potentiality, then the process is merely one of unfolding, and morality and instinct are identical except in degree. This fact then eliminates instinct.” The quotations given in this notice shows the author’s mode of treating the subject under consideration. His book is a response to the claim that there is such a thing as a religion of science. In the opening chapter he makes the following statement: “Professor Conklin makes it very clear that the religion of science is a present concrete fact.

He bring the argument of this work ("The Direction of Human Evolution") to a close with these words: 'Can this religion of science and evolution be *incorporated in the organized religions* of the civilized world?' This religion of science—and evolution—has been definitely outlined. It now exists. What is to be done with it?" The author adds: "The issue then today between religion and science is this concrete religion of science." It is this religion of science which Dr. Wood has studied critically and analyzed its claims thoroughly, and in his estimation found it wanting in substantial foundations. His book is worth a whole library of captious denunciations of the theory of evolution by writers who do not have a clear apprehension of the theory. I may not have grasped the full force of the argument of this book, nor detected the flaws and weakness in it. But the subject of which it treats is a live one at the present time and I am fully persuaded that those who will continue to write on it, whether pro or con, will do well to give Dr. Wood's presentation of it careful consideration.

A. E. TRUXAL

Flames of Faith. By William L. Stidger. The Abingdon Press. Pp. 204. Price, \$1.25.

An anthology of modern poetry which feeds the flames of faith, with analysis and running comment by the compiler. An autographic word of introduction by Edwin Markham in glowing terms commends the author as one, who "knows the poets: knows their purposes and their powers"; and "has the knowledge and the sympathy to interpret them." Mr. Markham also writes of the author's purpose to "make plain the courageous faith of these poets—their faith in man, home, country and God."

The writer is well known as the pastor of one of the largest churches of the country, who has been able by unusual methods of publicity to build up his constituency, and who has written a previous work of a similar kind, "Giant Hours with Poet Preachers." His selections in this volume

have been made for an audience of preachers and others who are interested in spiritual things. He writes from a personal acquaintance with many of the poets whose poems he cites, and with loving enthusiasm for his theme.

Selections are quoted from the works of Angela Morgan, Edith Daley, Edna Saint Vincent Millay, Anna H. Branch, Joyce Kilmer, George Sterling, F. L. Knowles, John Drinkwater, James W. Riley, Edgar Guest, Strickland Gillilan, and Amos R. Wells. Few of these would be rated as great poets, but from all of them, including those whom Mr. Stidger calls "everyday poets," he culls heart-warming and inspiring lines which, in the words of Mr. Markham, "will be a stay and a consolation for the spirit as we travel the long trail."

ROBERT J. PILGRAM

Religion as Experience. By John Wright Buckham. The Abingdon Press. Pp. 128. Price, \$1.00.

A small book, but thoughtful and forward-looking, is this collection of addresses and articles, which previously appeared in various magazines, under such headings as "Christian Experience," "Experiential Theology," "Christianity Among the Religions," "Christianity and Evolution," "Mysticism as Experience," and "Christian Experience and Christian Unity."

The central theme of all the chapters appears in the title of the book, with its recognition of the fact that "the deeper thought of our time is turning away from religion as dogma, as sentiment, as theory, as ethics, to religion as experience." The author defines Christian experience as "an individually enlightening and regenerative, ethically purifying, socially redemptive experience of God through the historical-spiritual person Jesus Christ." He studies this experience historically, analyzes it, compares it with other religions, and asserts, as a conclusion of his argument, that it is the source of doctrine and cult, that it brings a fresh revelation of the fundamental nature of all religion, reveals the universality

of Christianity as the interpretation and fulfillment of the religious life of humanity, and throws a flood of light on the nature and function of theology.

His closing chapter is a strong argument for the power of Christian experience, "faith, love, Christ in the soul," to bring about Christian unity.

ROBERT J. PILGRAM

Sermons for Juniors. By Thomas Wilson Dickert, M.A. Fleming H. Revell Company.

Books from the pens of Reformed preachers are being issued in rather rapid succession at the present time. All are of a high order and reflect credit upon the Reformed Church.

In its own field, this is true of none more so than of this little book of *Sermons for Juniors* by the popular and busy pastor of St. Stephen's Church, Reading, Pa. The volume most adequately memorializes his successful ministry among the children of his own parish.

A striking feature of the collection is the happy manner in which the author combines instruction and entertainment with a fine spirit of reverence for God and man and human life—a combination devoutly to be sought in all sermons and particularly in sermons for children. He has levied tribute upon many sources for facts and has made delighted journeys into realms of fancy, returning with choice treasure for the fancy-loving minds of his hearers.

The Table of Contents shows a great variety of subjects and a reading of the sermons makes evident, likewise, a great variety of treatment. The sermons are not poured out over the same mold. The age-old truths of christian faith are held up before the children but in a style that is not only clear and vivid but always new and fresh and never trite and faded. All in all, it is a book much worth while and one that will hold its own by comparison with the best of its kind.

The reviewer commends *Sermons for Juniors* unreservedly to all who seek in any way to place before the eager and plastic minds of children and youth the principles of morality and religion attractively clothed.

He hopes, also, that the publication of this book will encourage other ministers in our denomination, who have been notably successful in particular lines of their ministry, to give their work tangible expression through the printed page. The Rev. Mr. Dickert has done for "preaching to children" in the Reformed Church what other men might do and are able to do for "preaching the social gospel," "interpreting the Bible to the lay mind," "making worship attractive to the present age," "applying the social gospel to community life," "translating modern principles of religious education into a parish program," etc.

More of our ministers should take a hand in giving to the spirit and genius of the Reformed Church and her definite achievements today voice and form.

W. F. KOSMAN

Jesus as Judged by His Enemies. By James H. Snowden. Pages 246. The Abingdon Press, New York.

New books from the pen of Dr. Snowden no longer occasion surprise, for they make their appearance at brief intervals. But more significant than their increasing number is the fact that for the most part they receive a very cordial welcome from the readers of religious books. "*Jesus as Judged by His Enemies*," one of the latest fruits of Dr. Snowden's fertile mind, is bound to increase the number of his admirers because of the help they will obtain through reading this book.

It is easy enough to find praise for the Lord Christ in the words of His avowed followers. Jesus declared to the Pharisees that if the children would hold their peace the stones would cry out in His praise. But Dr. Snowden has gone still farther in that he has drawn praise for the Lord Jesus out of the mouth of His foes and from words that were intended to discredit and malign Him. Out of the three

score or more sayings of the enemies of Jesus recorded in the Gospels the author selected thirty and made each one of them the text for a brief chapter in which he expounded the thought implied in the unfriendly remark and skillfully turned the intended slur or indictment into an encomium of praise and glory.

But the author does not confine himself to the effort of eliciting praise for the Lord out of the mouth of His foes. He also has his eye on the problems of the present day and in every chapter applies the principles and truths under consideration to the problems of today. Thus in the chapter on "How knoweth this Man Letters?" He gives an interesting discourse on education, showing the tendency of mere school learning to become "conventionalized, professionalized, fossilized." He contrasts the professionally trained man with the man of native gift. He shows that in religion only that knowledge which grows out of experience and is "a well of water springing up in our hearts" will suffice to keep our religion from becoming "insipid and stale." That the subjects lend themselves to a very practical application to modern issues may be readily seen by glancing at topics like these: A False Worshiper; A New Teaching; Strange Things; Jesus as a Lawbreaker; A Trampler on Tradition; He stirreth up the People; etc. The author does full justice to the opportunities such topics afford him, and these practical teachings and exhortations alone give the book genuine worth.

The practical wisdom in which the book abounds, the excellent portrayal of the character and work of Jesus as evidenced by the testimony of His foes, and the clear literary style of the author constitute attractive features of this book. The pastor will find the book full of sermon seeds and the layman can at the same time harvest ripe fruit from its pages.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

Our Protestant Heritage. By W. Wofford T. Duncan. Price, \$1.00 net. Pages 130. The Methodist Book Concern. New York.

There is no scarcity of books which aim to point out the fallacies of the Roman Catholic Church, many of them written in a rather acrimonious spirit. There are also quite a number of books setting forth the principles of Protestantism. But books which give a fair treatment of the principles of Protestantism in contrast with those of Roman Catholicism are all too few. Hence "*Our Protestant Heritage*" should find a hearty welcome, especially among Protestant readers. For without indulging in ridicule or vituperation this book contrasts Catholic and Protestant principles, and further shows the relation and significance of these several principles to the fundamental principles of Americanism.

The book consists of a series of sermons called forth by the appearance in the public press of "sixty-five paid advertisements announcing Roman Catholic views of Christianity and the Church and discussing questions in dispute between Romanism and Protestantism." In these advertisements the claim was made that "Protestantism is not Scripturally or rationally sound." Such a claim naturally constituted a challenge to the defenders of Protestantism, and many of the pastors of the community "embraced the opportunity to clarify the thinking of their own people and such Roman Catholics as might attend, by the emphasis of Protestant fundamentals without either rabid denunciation or timid apology." The *raison d'être* of this book is therefore most praiseworthy.

The author discusses three principles of Protestantism which he claims to be not only essential to true religion but equally indispensable to true Americanism. These principles are, the right of private judgment, liberty of conscience, and direct access to God. These are discussed under the chapter headings: *Our Intellectual Heritage*, *Our Moral Heritage*, and *Our Spiritual Heritage*. The author sets

forth very clearly why these principles are fundamental in the true religion and essential to American liberty, and also why the Roman Church so persistently opposes them or accepts them with reservations.

Every Protestant who does not have a clear understanding or a keen appreciation of the fundamental principles of Protestantism and every Roman Catholic who really wants to know why Protestants can not join Catholics in their religious belief and practice will do well to read this book. It is a book which is bound to strengthen the convictions of Protestants and give much needed information to Catholics without necessarily creating any feeling of bitterness between the two religious bodies.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

That Ye May Relieve. By David Keppel. Price, \$0.60 net. Pages 86. The Methodist Book Concern. New York.

New books on the Fourth Gospel enlist the interest of the New Testament student perhaps more readily than do treatises on any other New Testament book. This fact rests upon a twofold basis. In the first place, the Fourth Gospel is cherished by many Bible readers as the most precious book in the New Testament, and therefore any new interpretation of its message receives at least a respectable hearing from the lovers of this Spiritual Gospel. In the second place, the Fourth Gospel also presents the student with some of the most perplexing problems connected with the interpretation of the New Testament. The critical student therefore is ever ready to welcome new books on this Gospel in the hope that it may help to solve some of the problems about which he is concerned.

"That Ye May Believe" is the title of a small book which aims to set forth the argument of this Gospel. The critic will find little in it to satisfy him; for critical questions are barely touched. To deal with such matters seems to have been far from the writer's purpose. On the other hand,

the student who is concerned about a simplified arrangement of the argument of the Gospel will, no doubt, read the book with profit. It is such readers the author seems to have had in mind.

In fourteen brief chapters covering no more than eighty pages he sums up the author's argument set forth to prove "that Jesus is indeed the Christ, the Son of God," and the grounds given for such belief in Christ "that we may have life through His name." In an orderly and concise form the testimony of John the Baptist, of the first disciples, of the miracles of Jesus, of inquirers like Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria, and of Jesus' own discourses is set forth in support of the Gospel's aim to show that Jesus is the Son of God and that men come to life through belief in Him.

Considering its restricted compass, this little book does all that may be expected of it, and its careful reading, easily accomplished at a single sitting, will not only convince the reader that the Fourth Gospel was written with a purpose but will also show him what that purpose was.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ